

2008

A Study of Job Satisfaction and School Board Relationships of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

Kishore Kuncham
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kuncham, Kishore, "A Study of Job Satisfaction and School Board Relationships of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York" (2008). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 2394.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2394>

A STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION AND SCHOOL BOARD RELATIONSHIPS
OF
PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS IN NASSAU AND SUFFOLK COUNTIES
(LONG ISLAND) IN NEW YORK

BY

KISHORE KUNCHAM

Dissertation Committee

Anthony Colella, Ph.D., Mentor
James Caulfield, Ed.D.
Josephine N. Moffett, Ed.D.
Edward Price, Ph.D.

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Requirement of the Degree of Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University

2008

Abstract

A Study of Job Satisfaction and School Board Relationships of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

The purpose of this study was to determine the overall job satisfaction, the level of intrinsic job satisfaction, and the level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York. Also, the study investigated the school board relationships of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York. The population of this study included all 125 public school superintendents of both Nassau and Suffolk Counties for the year 2007/2008. Despite many daunting challenges, the superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York were greatly satisfied with overall, intrinsic, and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction. The study indicated that the demographic variables such as age, gender, salary level, years of experience levels of education and district size did not have any significant impact by itself on the job satisfaction of the superintendents. The overall job satisfaction of superintendents with a doctorate and working in a larger size district combined contributed to slightly higher level of job satisfaction. However, neither of these two factors alone accounted for a significant proportion of variance in general satisfaction. There were no significant differences in the satisfaction factors *between* Nassau and Suffolk Counties public school superintendents. There were no statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of Nassau and Suffolk superintendents in New York and Hunterdon and Somerset superintendents in New Jersey. The study revealed significantly higher satisfaction scores for the Long Island superintendents compared to affluent (DFG I&J) New Jersey districts. The study concluded that Long Island superintendents maintained very positive working relationships with school boards, highly satisfied with their leadership and ethical conduct, and enjoyed overwhelming community support. The Long Island superintendents expressed significantly higher level of positive relationships with their school boards in comparison to the national study as reported in *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study by American Association of School Administrators (2007)*.

@Copyright by Kishore Kuncham, 2008
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with deep gratitude I would like to acknowledge many individuals for helping me during my doctoral work.

It is with much appreciation that I thank my mentor, Dr. Anthony Colella, for his wisdom, generous time, commitment, and encouragement. He inspired me throughout my doctoral work with his intellect, positive attitude, and outstanding leadership. My special thanks to Dr. James Caulfield for his support, guidance, and commitment. Most importantly, he motivated me to complete my doctoral program. I extend many thanks to my colleague and friend, Dr. Edward Price for his input, insight, and thoughtful suggestions as a member of my dissertation committee. My sincere thanks to Dr. Josephine Moffett for many years of her support, thoughtful recommendations, friendship, and inspiring me to go for my doctorate.

This research would not have been possible without the support and cooperation of public school superintendents of Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York who had participated in this study.

DEDICATION

It is my honor to dedicate this work to my parents – thank you for your love, kindness, positive attitude, and confidence in me. I will be ever grateful all my life for having the honor to be your son.

It is with all my love that I dedicate this work to my wife Raji. Her persistent encouragement, perseverance, patience, understanding, and unconditional love allowed me to complete this challenging task. Her devotion to our family and deepest love is our strength and blessing. She is my inspiration and I owe her very much.

To my sons Bharat and Siddharth– their love, intellect and humor makes everyday a special day. I am very proud of both of them and continue to learn so much from them. My completion of doctoral work is to prove “never give up,” and live up to what I preach. I love you both very much.

Finally, I am blessed to have met this amazing person, Sri Sri Ravi Shankar, who deeply touched my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Superintendency	5
Job Satisfaction	8
Relationships and Practical Implications	10
Public School Superintendent-School Board Relationships	13
Purpose of Study	14
Research Questions	16
Limitations of the Study	18
Definition of Terms	18
Organization of the Study	21
II LITERATURE REVIEW	23
Meaning of Job Satisfaction	23
Significance of Job Satisfaction	25
Theories/Models of Job Satisfaction	26
Studies on School Superintendent Job Satisfaction	39
School Board and Public School Superintendent Relationships	44
Measurement of Job Satisfaction	48
III METHODOLOGY	54
Population	55
Procedure	56
Instrumentation	57
Data Analysis	61
IV ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	63
Demographics	65
Job Satisfaction Data - Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Short Form)	71
Board-Superintendent Relationships Survey	77
Comparison of Board-Superintendent Relationships	86
Research Questions	92
Supplemental Research	109

V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	113
Summary of Research	120
Demographic Data	120
Board-Superintendent Relationships Survey Data.....	122
Job Satisfaction and Board-Superintendent Relationships Conclusions	124
Research Question 1.....	124
Research Question 2.....	125
Research Question 3.....	126
Research Question 4.....	127
Research Question 5.....	128
Research Question 6.....	129
Research Question 7.....	130
Research Question 8.....	131
Research Question 9.....	132
Discussion	134
Recommendations for Practice	136
Recommendations for Policy.....	137
Recommendations for Further Study	138
Conclusion	139
REFERENCES	142
APPENDIX A: Superintendent’s Letter	159
APPENDIX B: Superintendent Demographic Survey.....	161
APPENDIX C: Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Sample.....	163
APPENDIX D: Board-Superintendent Relationships Survey & Permission Letter	167

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 1 – Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Age	66
Table 2 – Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Gender	66
Table 3 – Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Salary.....	67
Table 4 - Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Doctoral Degree	68
Table 5 – Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by District Size.....	68
Table 6 - Distribution of Public School Superintendents of District in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Structure	69
Table 7 – Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Type of District	69
Table 8 – Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Number of Years Experience as a Superintendent.....	70
Table 9 – Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Number of Years Experience as a Superintendent in the Current Position	71
Table 10 – Distribution of Perceived General Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	72
Table 11 – Distribution of Perceived Intrinsic Job Satisfaction by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	73
Table 12 – Distribution of Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	74
Table 13 – Distribution of Perceived General Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents Between Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	75

Table 14 – Distribution of Perceived Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents Between Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	76
Table 15 – Distribution of Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents Between Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	77
Table 16 – Distribution of Superintendents’ Perspective on How Well the Board Leads the District in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	79
Table 17 – Distribution of the Approximate Length of Time (in years) a Board Member Serves in School Districts of Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	80
Table 18 – Distribution of Superintendents’ Opinion on the Most Important Reason for Being Hired in Nassau Counties (Long Island) in New York	81
Table 19 – Distribution of Time Spent in Direct Communication with Board Members per Week by the Superintendents’ in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	82
Table 20 – Distribution of Characteristics of Present Relationship with the Board as Responded by the Superintendents’ in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	82
Table 21 – Distribution of Board’s Primary Expectation for Superintendent as Perceived by the Superintendents’ in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	83
Table 22 – Distribution of Superintendents’ Perspective of Board Ethics in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	84
Table 23 – Distribution of Superintendents’ Leaving a District Due to Ethical Problems in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	85
Table 24 - Comparison of Perspective on How Well the Board Leads the District in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and AASA Study	86
Table 25 - Comparison of the Approximate Length of Time (in years) a Board Member Serves in School Districts of Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and the AASA Study	87
Table 26 – Distribution of Superintendents’ Opinion on the Most Important Reason for Being Hired in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	88

Table 27 – Comparison of Time Spent in Direct Communication with Board Members per Week by the Superintendents’ in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and AASA Study 2006	89
Table 28 – Comparison of Characteristics of Present Relationship with the Board as Responded by the Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	89
Table 29 – Comparison of Board’s Primary Expectation for Superintendent as Perceived by the Superintendents’ in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and AASA 2006 Study	90
Table 30 – Comparison of Superintendents’ Perspective of Board Ethics in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and AASA Study 2006.....	91
Table 31 – Comparison of Superintendents’ Leaving a District Due to Ethical Problems in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and AASA Study 2006	91
Table 32 – General Job Satisfaction Range of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	93
Table 33 – General Job Satisfaction Mean Scores Reported by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York.....	94
Table 34 – Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Range of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	95
Table 35 - Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Mean Scores as Reported by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	96
Table 36 – Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Range of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	97
Table 37 –Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Mean Scores as Reported by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York	97
Table 38 – Regression Model Summary: Predicting General Satisfaction from District Size and Doctorate	99
Table 39 – ANOVA General Job Satisfaction and District Size and Doctorate.....	99
Table 40 – Coefficients General Job Satisfaction and District Size and Doctorate	99

Table 41 – Comparison of Nassau and Suffolk Counties – Overall, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Mean and Standard Deviation Scores.....100

Table 42 – Independent Sample Test of Overall, Intrinsic, and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Between Nassau and Suffolk Counties101

Table 43 – Comparison of How Well the Board Leads the District Between Long Island Districts and AASA Study 2006105

Table 44 – Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio Test for How Well the Board Leads the District..... 105

Table 45 – Mann-Whitney Test Comparison: How Well the Board Leads the District.106

Table 46– Relationship with Board: Comparison of Long Island Districts and AASA Survey 2006107

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

More than 45 years ago, an author who identified himself only as a Veteran Fighter in the Field of American Education made this following comment about the state of the superintendency:

“The point I wish to make is that nothing, absolutely nothing, is of more vital consuming interest to the average superintendent than the tremendously important question of whether he will be retained in his present position for the coming year. He knows from statistics, observations and experiences that he is in the most hazardous occupation known to insurance actuaries. Deep sea diving and structural steel work have nothing on the business of school superintending. Lloyds will insure the English clerk against rain on his weekend vacation, but no gambling house would be sufficiently reckless to bet on the chances of re-election for school superintendents three years or even two years ahead” (Sharp & Walter, 2004, p.18).

Chandler and Childress (1957) reported that the job of the superintendent has become exceedingly complex due to the fact that the role of the superintendent places him in two almost diametrically opposed relationships. In the first relationship, the superintendent must be the executive officer of the board of education; in the second relationship, the superintendent is the educational leader of teachers, administrators, the community, and the board of education.

The superintendency carries with it an extremely broad job description, filled with an ever-widening range of duties and responsibilities. These responsibilities have increased so much that no single person can any longer fulfill the position satisfactorily (Southworth, 1968).

Houston (2001), the executive director of the American Association of School Administrators, noted of the public school superintendency is impossible, the expectations are inappropriate, the training is inadequate, and the pipeline is inverted. Houston mentions a number of trends that have made district leadership so difficult: changing demographics and growing diversity, a fragmenting culture, deregulation of power, and increased accountability with no authority.

One has only to check the classified employment listings in *Education Week* or *AASA Job Bulletin* to recognize the abundance of opportunities and the apparent dearth of applicants for superintendent positions. Even mainstream publications have pronounced the job's loss of luster.

Nationwide, stories about vacant superintendent positions are attracting far fewer applicants than in the past. Reports from search consultants, superintendents, school boards, and state agencies point as well to a fast developing shortage of talented and experienced people eager to take top district management posts (Glass, 2000).

During the past several years, education policy has been in the forefront of American politics and superintendents have no choice but to carry the burden and provide leadership. Education in the United States is under intense scrutiny by public and private interest groups. Our schools and communities continue to look for extraordinary educational leadership to move our schools forward.

Most commentators today would portray superintendency as a thankless and sometimes impossible job. Superintendents face serious challenges with the mounting pressure to improve student achievement and to provide safe schools for students. Most superintendents, teachers and administrators are trying to make schools better places of learning for students. Yet progress has been frustratingly slow.

People spend an average of one-third of life working. Work defines one's main source of social standing, helps to define who a person is, and affects one's health both physically and mentally. Because of work's central role in many people's lives, satisfaction with one's job is an important component in overall well-being. Are superintendents satisfied with their jobs?

Statement of the Problem

The news media has focused on reports of massive turnover in the job of superintendency and superintendent firings, and they continue to write about conflicts between superintendents and their school boards. Search consultants and school districts are finding an inadequate pool of candidates for superintendent jobs. Many wonder if it is possible to manage all of the job's complex responsibilities effectively.

State educators and lawmakers devote so much time and attention to dealing with teacher shortages that a looming deficit of qualified school superintendents has gone practically unnoticed. The trend is accelerated by a generation of educators who are reaching retirement age and find that new stresses make the job less desirable than in the past. There is a general lack of respect for superintendents. They become someone to attack when things don't go well (Cooper & Carella, 2000).

In a 1996 study titled "When Is Tenure Long Enough?" Gary Yee and Larry Cuban determined that the mean tenure for superintendents of the nation's 25 largest districts who were in office in 1990 was 5.76 years. They also found that tenure has declined significantly since the middle of the last century when it averaged 13-14 years and that although tenure in 1990 was at its lowest recorded point, there have been previous cycles of increase and decrease, even in recent decades.

The public school superintendency in New York, as in other states, has become a difficult position with many challenges such as high stakes testing, inadequate financial resources, stress, accountability, long hours, unfunded mandates, and pressure from special interest groups. These factors have made the position less attractive, hence resulting in low job satisfaction or high job dissatisfaction. *The 6th Triennial Study of the Superintendency in New York (Rogers, 2006)* reports that the recent turnover in the superintendency is seen as both a threat and an opportunity. It is a threat because persistent turnover erodes districts' capacity to raise student achievement and places pressure on an already strained applicant pool to produce leadership talent. However, it is an opportunity to identify a new generation of educational leaders and to build a more diverse profession.

Superintendency

The role of a public school superintendent has become extremely challenging. It has evolved from a clerk for the local schools to a very important educational leader in the community.

Konnert and Augenstein (1990) noted that the superintendent at different times and in different situations is a leader, coach, manager, follower, motivator, philosopher,

missionary, policy maker, politician, sales person, evaluator, and distributor of scarce resources.

To outsiders, the role of the school superintendent has always been a little mystifying. Most people can explain that the superintendent is the ultimate "person in charge," but what superintendents actually do remains vague.

In truth, superintendents themselves may sometimes wonder. Their once imposing authority has eroded considerably in the last several decades. State and federal policymakers have not hesitated to impose major mandates on districts and a variety of special-interest groups have become assertive about advancing their agenda through the schools. Parents and teachers are more inclined to demand a seat at the decision-making table, and a growing number of charter schools are public but not fully answerable to the district. Most of all, standards-based accountability has made reform not just the trademark of progressive superintendents but a minimum expectation for the job.

In an occupation enjoying very little security (Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella, 2000), having fewer benefits than similar jobs in the private sector, and facing increased criticism in addition to greater complexities (Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000), the role of the school superintendent could be characterized as formidable.

How are superintendents responding to their changed environment? What leadership strategies are they using? Is the superintendency in a state of crisis, as some assert, or is it just adapting to fit the times? (Lashway, 2001)

As the complexity of the job has increased, so have fears of a dwindling pool of qualified leaders. Cooper, Fusarelli, and Carella (2000) found that almost 90 percent of the superintendents they surveyed agreed that the applicant shortage represents a crisis in the superintendency.

However, this seemingly grim assessment does not tell the whole story. Other studies have indicated that the average tenure of superintendents is at least 5 years, even in supposedly volatile urban settings (National School Boards Association 2002; Glass, Bjork & Brunner, 2000). While almost a quarter serve less than 3 years, the majority appear to have a reasonable amount of time to make an impact on their districts.

In addition, surveys reveal a district leadership cadre that is largely confident and committed, if sometimes frustrated. For example, 69 percent of superintendents in a Public Agenda survey agreed that with the right leadership, even the most troubled school districts can be turned around (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett & Feleni, 2001). Glass, Bjork and Brunner (2000) found that only 6 percent of their sample said they derived little or no satisfaction from their jobs.

How do superintendents navigate through the leadership maze? Arguing that "conflict is the DNA of the superintendency," Cuban (1998) said that superintendents struggle to create coherence out of the numerous and sometimes incompatible goals that the public sets for schools. Expected to improve the system, but lacking direct control over the classroom, most district administrators have to create their own personal cause-effect models and rely on luck.

Cuban (1998) notes that superintendents must fashion a solution out of three sometimes-conflicting roles: instructional, managerial, and political. As instructional leaders, they bear ultimate responsibility for improving student achievement. As managerial leaders, they have to keep their districts operating efficiently, with minimum friction, yet taking risks to make necessary changes. As political leaders, they have to negotiate with multiple stakeholders to get approval for programs and resources.

All the roles are apparently necessary. Johnson (1996) found the same three themes in her in depth study of superintendents, as did Nestor-Baker and Hoy (2001). The latter study also found that superintendents spent the most time thinking about the interpersonal dimensions of their political and managerial roles, especially in dealing with a board.

The evolving role of the superintendent presents challenges for universities, policymakers, researchers, school boards, and superintendents themselves. Superintendents need a thorough grounding in the complexities of today's instructional leadership; a few courses in curriculum and supervision will no longer do the job. Superintendents should put instruction at the top of the district's agenda. While the managerial and political dimensions of the job will not go away, those roles should be aligned with the overriding goal of continuous instructional improvement.

As long as the push for standards-based accountability remains strong, district leaders can expect a turbulent and stressful job climate. The passage of the *No Child Left Behind Act* has turned up the heat even more by putting the full weight of federal policy behind the accountability movement, mandating that schools bring *all* children - including such sub-groups as racial minorities, English-language learners, and students

with disabilities - to an adequate level of progress. At the same time, superintendents continue to find creative responses to the challenge. If the current situation is a crisis, it is the kind of crisis that energizes rather than paralyzes.

How superintendents react to these dimensions and how superintendents adjust their leadership to those new challenges will determine perceived job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction (Hoyle, 1989).

According to Cooper, Fusarelli, and Carella (2000), the public perception of the superintendency is that of a job so daunting that few individuals desire to pursue the challenge. Given the challenges of the job, one pressing question is what are the factors that lead to superintendents' job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or turnover in the field?

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is the extent to which people like their jobs. Some people enjoy work and some people hate work. Job satisfaction is the most frequently studied variable in organizational behavior research.

Locke (1969) defines job satisfaction "as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job value. Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from a one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing" (p.316).

Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992) defines job satisfaction as “an affective reaction to a job that results in the incumbent’s comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired” (p. 1).

Brief (1998) expresses “job satisfaction is an internal state that is expressed by affectively and/or cognitively evaluating an experienced job with some degree of favor or disfavor” (p.86).

Spector (1997) defines job satisfaction as “how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (p.2). Weiss (2002) has argued that job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect (emotion), beliefs and behaviors. This definition suggests that we form attitudes towards our jobs by taking into account our feelings, our beliefs, and our behaviors.

Munford (1972) recommends to “consider job satisfaction in terms of the degree of fit between what an organization requires of its employees and what the employees are seeking from the firm” (p.5). Schultz (1982) defined job satisfaction as “the psychological disposition of people toward their work – and this includes a collection of numerous attitudes and feelings” (p.287).

Relationships and Practical Implications

Job satisfaction is the most common topic studied relative to work and is an important indicator of how employees feel about their jobs. Also, it is a predictor of work behaviors such as organizational commitment, absenteeism, and turnover.

Lawler and Porter (1967) and Lawler (1973) suggest studying job satisfaction because of the strong correlations between job satisfaction and absenteeism and the strong correlation with job turnover. They maintain that people are motivated to do things which they feel they have a high success of leading to rewards they value. They also bring to light that research for job satisfaction stems from a low but consistent association with job performance.

One common research finding is that job satisfaction is correlated with life satisfaction. This correlation is reciprocal, meaning people who are satisfied with life tend to be satisfied with their job and people who are satisfied with their job tend to be satisfied with life. However, some research has found that job satisfaction is not significantly related to life satisfaction when other variables such as non-work satisfaction and core self-evaluations are taken into account.

An important finding for organizations to note is that job satisfaction has a rather tenuous correlation to productivity on the job. This is a vital piece of information to researchers and businesses, as the idea that satisfaction and job performance are directly related to one another is often cited in the media and in some non-academic management literature. In short, the relationship of satisfaction to productivity is not necessarily

straightforward and can be influenced by a number of other work-related constructs, and the notion that "a happy worker is a productive worker" should not be the foundation of organizational decision-making.

With regard to job performance, employee personality may be more important than job satisfaction. The link between job satisfaction and performance is thought to be a spurious relationship; instead, both satisfaction and performance are the result of personality.

There are various reasons why it is important to study job satisfaction and research linked with it. Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992) noted that "Organizations measure job satisfaction primarily because of its presumed direct relationship to the short-term goals of cost reduction through increased individual productivity and reduced absences, errors, turnover, and so on" (p.6). According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction is studied because it can lead to behaviors that affect organizational functioning as job satisfaction is perceived as a reflection of good treatment. Vroom (1998) also maintains that job satisfaction is vital if organizations want to reach their goals.

Thompson, McNamara, and Hoyle (1977) looked at the first 26 volumes of *Educational Administration Quarterly* and its 474 articles. Their research concluded that only 41 articles addressed the subject of job satisfaction in education, of which only three articles were committed exclusively to the job satisfaction of the administrator.

Blackman and Fenwick (2000) "It is becoming increasingly difficult to secure highly qualified educational leaders" (p.68). The Institute for Educational Leadership

(2004) warns that the nation is facing a serious educational leadership void and strengthening educational leadership must become a national priority in order to make higher standards a reality.

Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, and Glass (2005) emphasized that the twenty-first century superintendents must have skills to augment instructional methods, interpret assessment data, as well as explain their district's achievement level compared to others in the state and nation.

Hoyle and colleagues (2005) expressed that the success or failure of various superintendents (length of tenure) is a subject that is ambiguous and not thoroughly researched. Adding to the ambiguity, Gardner's (1990) statement holds true, "Despite length of tenure, one thing is certain, for good or bad, the system will survive the superintendent" (p.12).

There has been much speculation by the media about superintendent tenure and turnover; however, very little quantitative research exists detailing the characteristics of superintendent tenure and job satisfaction. Another reason to study job satisfaction is due to the necessity to recruit and retain qualified superintendents. Recruitment, selection, and retention of highly qualified public school superintendents are challenges faced by school boards across the country. The identification of general satisfaction, intrinsic, and extrinsic factors that are related to job satisfaction among superintendents, are critical to school boards looking for recruitment and retention strategies.

Public School Superintendent-School Board Relationships

Board relationships are a continuing issue for district leaders. Despite theoretical clarity in the division of labor (the board sets policy and the superintendent executes it), the practical application is much more ambiguous. Conflicts between the board and the superintendent can occur like in any other relationship. The school board's most important decision is its selection of a superintendent. If a major problem occurs between the superintendent and board member(s), it rapidly filters through the organization, schools and community creating ambiguity in district direction and leadership. If a conflict cannot be resolved, it is likely there will be a change in superintendency by nonrenewal, dismissal, buyout or retirement.

The Board of Education is the key link in school district governance. Elected publicly, boards are responsible for oversight of school districts, hiring superintendents, goal setting, and evaluating the attainment of these goals. An effective board is an irreplaceable asset in raising student achievement; ineffective boards are an inevitable impediment.

The relationship between a board and superintendent establishes a model for the district environment. A cooperative and harmonious relationship will make district employees feel secure as expectations are clear, roles are clarified and ambiguity does not exist. Conflict between the superintendent and board creates tension, discouraging program innovation and reform, and constructive community participation in the schools. It certainly can be critical to any budget, bond or other referenda attempts. Unfortunately, many districts are not meeting the challenge of board and superintendent relations.

Although boards accept most of their administrators' policy recommendations (Glass and Franceschini), superintendents have to work hard to frame issues in a way that will garner majority support.

Although, there have been studies on superintendent's job satisfaction in various other states such as New Jersey, Alaska, Texas, and Pennsylvania, there is very little research or few studies in the State of New York.

Purpose of the Study

The news media has focused on reports of massive turnover in the job of superintendency and superintendent firings and continue to write about conflicts between superintendents and their school boards. Search consultants and school districts are finding an inadequate pool of candidates for superintendent jobs. Many wonder if it is possible to manage all of the job's complex responsibilities effectively.

Mark Twain is reported to have defined the successful person as one who gets up in the morning and is excited to meet each day. Is job satisfaction important? The public school superintendency in New York, as in other states, has become a difficult position with many challenges such as high stakes testing, inadequate financial resources, stress, accountability, long hours, unfunded mandates, and pressure from special interest groups. These have made the position less attractive, with low job satisfaction or high job dissatisfaction.

The purpose of this study was to determine the overall job satisfaction, the level of intrinsic job satisfaction, and the level of extrinsic job satisfaction and school board relationships of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York. The study was to determine the level of relationship between

overall job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) and the impact of selected factors of age, gender, salary level, years of experience, levels of education, and district size. The study included to: (a) examine whether there are statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents *between* Nassau County and Suffolk County (Long Island) in New York, (b) examine to see whether there are statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey, and (c) public school superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey.

Glass and Franceschini (2007) noted that the superintendents are generally pleased with their board's performance. The school board's most important decision is its selection of a superintendent. Conflicts between the board and the superintendent can occur as in any other relationship. If a major problem occurs between the superintendent and the board member(s), it rapidly filters through the organization, schools and community, creating ambiguity in district direction and leadership. If a conflict cannot be resolved, it is likely there will be a change in superintendency by nonrenewal, dismissal, buyout or retirement. Board relationships are a continuing issue for district leaders.

The study also examined the level of relationship between the board and public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and determine if there were any significant differences in the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York (as measured by the American Association of School

Administrators' 2006 State of the Superintendency Survey) in comparison to *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study* by American Association of School Administrators (Glass and Franceschini, 2007).

The results of the study would be helpful to superintendents and school boards in several ways. It would answer whether or not the superintendents in Long Island are satisfied with their jobs and school board relationships, and where they feel the greatest sense of satisfaction from the job. The study would help the boards and the superintendents know the factors that make superintendents gain the most personal satisfaction, feeling of fulfillment in their job, and factors that will contribute to their success. The study would help the school boards by providing recruitment and retention strategies. The identification of the level of school board-superintendent relationships could help superintendents and the school boards build mutual trust and understanding, develop roles and expectations, and build a shared vision.

Research Questions

1. What is the overall level of satisfaction of job public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?
2. What is the level of intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York?
3. What is the level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York?
4. What is the level of relationship between overall job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and

the impact of factors such as: age, gender, salary level, years of experience, levels of education, and the school district size?

5. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents between Nassau County and Suffolk County (Long Island) in New York?

6. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

7. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey?

8. What is the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, using the American Association of School Administrators' 2006 State of the Superintendency Survey?

9. Are there any significant differences in the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' 2006 *State of the Superintendency Survey*) in comparison to *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study* by American Association of School Administrators (Glass and Franceschini (2007))?

Limitations of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the job satisfaction of public school superintendents and school board-superintendent relationships in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York. The study included the use of questionnaires to measure the job satisfaction and school board-superintendent relationships of public school superintendents. The use of a questionnaire as a tool to gather data might have had limitations. The questionnaire was dependant on the voluntary participation of the public school superintendents, who might have not responded truthfully or with candor. The study was limited to the superintendents who were in employ for 2007/2008. The participants willingness to participate and time taken to answer the questions could have influenced the responses, as the questionnaire was a self-reporting instrument.

Definition of Terms

Superintendent: The superintendent is the chief administrative officer of a public school district.

Job Satisfaction: Spector (1997) defines job satisfaction as “how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (p.2). Weiss (1969) has argued that job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect (emotion), beliefs and behaviors. This definition suggests that we form attitudes towards our jobs by taking into account our feelings, our beliefs, and our behaviors.

Intrinsic Job Satisfaction: Ryan and Deci (2000) describes intrinsic motivation as something a person derives from within or from the activity itself that positively affects behavior, performance, and well being.

Satisfaction derived from factors/reinforcers in the work environment that are inherent in the work itself(i.e., achievement) (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1977).

Extrinsic Job Satisfaction: Satisfaction derived from actions that result in the attainment of externally administered rewards, including pay, material possessions, prestige, and positive evaluations from others.

Satisfaction derived from factors/reinforcers in the work environment that are extraneous to the work itself(i.e., salary) (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1977).

Overall Job Satisfaction: Defined as “a person’s affective reaction to his total work role” (Lawler, 1973, p.64).

School District Size: The total number of students enrolled in a public school district in the school year 2007-08, as reported by school districts to the New York State Education Department in October, 2007.

Long Island School Districts: When the New York State Education Department refers to Long Island school districts, it includes school districts within Nassau and Suffolk Counties only. The western most end of Long Island contains the New York City boroughs of Brooklyn (Kings County) and Queens (Queens County), and the central and eastern portions contain Nassau and Suffolk counties. However, colloquial usage of the term "Long Island" or "the Island" refers only to the suburban Nassau and Suffolk Counties; the more urban Brooklyn and Queens are not always thought of as being part of

Long Island, as they are politically part of New York City, though geographically they are on the Island.

Boss/Supervisor: For responses on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1977), the board of education is considered as the “boss/supervisor” for superintendent.

Company: For responses on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1977), the school district is considered as the “company” for superintendent.

District Factor Grouping (DFG): The District Factor Groups (DFGs) were first developed in 1975, by the New Jersey Department of Education, for the purpose of comparing students’ performance on statewide assessments across demographically similar school districts. The categories are updated every ten years when the Census Bureau releases the latest Decennial Census data. Since the DFGs were created, they have been used for purposes other than analyzing test score performance. The DFGs represent an approximate measure of a community’s relative socioeconomic status (SES). The classification system provides a useful tool for examining student achievement and comparing similarly-situated school districts in other analyses.

In updating the District Factor Groups (DFGs) using the data from the most recent Decennial Census, efforts were made to improve the methodology while preserving the underlying meaning of the DFG classification system. After discussing the measure with representatives from school districts and experimenting with various methods, the DFGs

were calculated using the following six variables that are closely related to SES: (1) Percent of adults with no high school diploma; (2) Percent of adults with some college education; (3) Occupational status; (4) Unemployment rate; (5) Percent of individuals in poverty; and (6) Median family income. Districts are arranged in 10 groups, DFG A through DFG J, A being the group with the lowest socioeconomic status, J being the highest. Districts in the A and B groups are the poorest and most educationally challenged, while those in I and J groups are the wealthiest and most successful. There are 128 wealthier suburban districts in District Factor Groups (DFG) I and J (New Jersey Department of Education, <http://www.state.nj.us/njded/finance/sf/dfgdesc.shtml>).

Organization of the Study

This study is structured into five chapters. Chapter I includes the introduction, the study's significance, problem statement, purpose, research questions, definition of terms, limitations, and organization of the study. Chapter II provides a review of the literature related to the job satisfaction of public school superintendents. The main goal of the literature review is to research key information regarding the construct of job satisfaction and the individuals who serve as public school superintendents. The literature review addresses the (a) meaning of job satisfaction, (b) significance of job satisfaction, (c) theories/models of job satisfaction, (d) studies of public school superintendent job satisfaction, (e) school board and public school superintendent relationships, and (f) measurement of job satisfaction. Chapter III describes the sample population, instrumentation, data collection and the description of data analysis. Chapter IV includes the analysis and findings of the data collected from the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York. Chapter V provides a summary

of the study, findings, conclusions and recommendations relating to Long Island public school superintendents' job satisfaction and school board relationships for future research. This study will conclude with a list of references and appendices which includes the survey instruments used.

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a review of the literature related to the job satisfaction of public school superintendents. The main goal of the literature review is to research key information regarding the construct of job satisfaction and the individuals who serve as public school superintendents. The literature review addresses the (a) meaning of job satisfaction, (b) significance of job satisfaction, (c) theories/models of job satisfaction, (d) studies of public school superintendent job satisfaction, (e) school board and public school superintendent relationships and, (f) measurement of job satisfaction.

Meaning of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is one of the most researched areas of organizational behavior and education. Job satisfaction, according to McCormick and Ilgen (1985), it is an association of attitudes held by an organization's members. The way employees respond toward their work is an indication of the commitment towards their employers. This is an important area of research because job satisfaction is correlated to enhanced job performance, positive work values, high levels of employee motivation, and lower rates of absenteeism, turnover and burnout (Begley & Czajka, 1993; Tharenou, 1993). Job satisfaction is the level to which people like their jobs. Some people enjoy work and find it to be the most important point of life.

Job satisfaction is generally viewed as the attitude of the worker toward the job (Lawlor, 1973).

Locke (1976) gives a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Job

satisfaction is a result of employees' perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important.

According to Locke's classical definition of job satisfaction (Locke, 1976, 1984), this construct consists of evaluating how the needs of an employee are fulfilled through the presence of certain conditions, or the achievement of goals in the work setting, that are aligned to the value priorities of the subject.

Vroom (1964), who used the terms job satisfaction and job attitudes interchangeably, considers job satisfaction as affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are currently occupying.

According to Mitchell and Lasan (1987), it is generally recognized in the organizational behavior field that job satisfaction is the most important and frequently studied attitude.

Senge (1990) found that without commitment, substantive change becomes problematic.

In order for an organization to be successful it must continuously ensure the satisfaction of employees. Berry (1997) argues that job satisfaction is an individual's reaction to the job experience.

Luthans (1998) noted that there are three important dimensions to job satisfaction.

They are as follows:

Job satisfaction is an emotional response to a job situation. As such it cannot be seen, it can only be inferred.

Job satisfaction is often determined by how well outcomes meet or exceed expectations. For instance, if organization participants feel that they are working much harder than others in the department but are receiving fewer rewards, they will probably have negative attitudes toward the work, the boss and or coworkers. On the other hand, if they feel they are being treated very well and are being paid equitably, they are likely to have positive attitudes toward the job.

Job satisfaction represents several related attitudes which are most important characteristics of a job about which people have effective response. These are: the work itself, pay, promotion opportunities, supervision, and coworkers.

Significance of Job Satisfaction

Is job satisfaction important? This question may seem to have a simple answer. It seems obvious that a happy employee is a more productive employee.

Spector (1997) stated that job satisfaction is the behavior by an employee intended to help coworkers or the organization. Spector (1997) presented three reasons to clarify the importance of job satisfaction. First, organizations can be directed by humanitarian values. Based on these values, they will attempt to treat their employees honorably and with respect. Job satisfaction assessment can then serve as an indicator of the extent to

which employees are dealt with effectively. High levels of job satisfaction could also be a sign of emotional wellness or mental fitness. Second, organizations can take on a utilitarian position in which employees' behavior would be expected to influence organizational operations according to the employees' degree of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction can be expressed through positive behaviors and job dissatisfaction through negative behaviors. Third, job satisfaction can be an indicator of organizational operations. Assessment of job satisfaction might identify various levels of satisfaction among organizational departments and, therefore, be helpful in pinning down areas in need of improvement. Spector (1997) believed that each one of the reasons is validation enough of the significance of job satisfaction and that combination of the reasons provided an understanding of the focus on job satisfaction.

Bruce and Blackburn (1992) state that the issue is not whether satisfaction and performance are directly and strongly correlated. The issue is that in order to attract and retain qualified employees in the upcoming tight labor market, employers will have to treat people as their most important asset.

Theories/Models of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been a topic of interest and study for decades. Many theorists have tried to come up with a rationale for why people feel the way they do about their job.

One of the earliest and most major studies of job satisfaction were the Hawthorne Studies. Elton Mayo is known as the founder of the Human Relations Movement, and is known for his research including the Hawthorne Studies. The experiments began in 1927

at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company in Cicero, Illinois (1927-1932). Mayo joined in early 1928. The Western Electric Company, manufacturer of telephone equipment at its Hawthorne Works, had a policy of high wages and good working conditions for employees and of using modern placement techniques (Trahair, 1984).

In collaboration with the National Research Council, the company studied the relationship between the intensity of illumination at work and the output of workers. These studies ultimately showed that novel changes in work conditions temporarily increase productivity (called the Hawthorne Effect). Researchers concluded that changes in output could be attributed to changes not only in work conditions, but also work attitudes and social relations.

Mayo (1945, p. 72) explained: "What actually happened was that six individuals became a team and the team gave itself wholeheartedly and spontaneously to cooperation in the experiment. The consequence was that they felt themselves to be participating freely and without afterthought, and were happy in the knowledge that they were working without coercion from above or limitation from below."

The single most important discovery of the Hawthorne experiments was that workers had a strong need to *cooperate* and *communicate* with fellow workers. In Mayo's words (1945, p. 112), "... the eager human desire for cooperative activity still persists in the ordinary person and can be utilized by intelligent and straightforward management. This finding provided strong evidence that people work for purposes other than pay, which paved the way for researchers to investigate other factors in job satisfaction."

Scientific management also had a significant impact on the study of job satisfaction. Frederick W. Taylor was a mechanical engineer whose writings on efficiency and scientific management were widely read. He was the founder of "systems engineering," and the author of *Principles of Scientific Management*, a collection of his essays published in 1911. This book contributed to a change in industrial production philosophies, causing a shift from skilled labor and piecework towards the more modern approach of assembly lines and hourly wages.

Taylor (1911) observed that, to work according to scientific laws, the management must take over and perform much of the work which is now left to the men; almost every act of the workman should be preceded by one or more preparatory acts of the management which enable him to do his work better and quicker than he otherwise could. Also, each man should daily be taught by and receive the friendliest help from those who are over him, instead of being, at the one extreme, driven or coerced by his bosses, and or left to his own unaided devices. This close, intimate, personal cooperation between the management and the men who are being supervised is of the essence of modern scientific or task management.

Taylor's scientific management consisted of four principles:

1. Replace rule-of-thumb work methods with methods based on a scientific study of the tasks.
2. Scientifically select, train, and develop each employee rather than passively leaving them to train themselves.

3. Provide detailed instruction and supervision of each worker in the performance of that worker's discrete task.

4. Divide work nearly equally between managers and workers, so that the managers apply scientific management principles to planning the work and the workers actually perform the tasks.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is a theory in psychology that Abraham Maslow proposed in his 1943 paper "A Theory of Human Motivation." This theory explains that people seek to satisfy five specific needs in life – physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, self-esteem needs, and self-actualization needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs is often depicted as a pyramid consisting of five levels: the four lower levels are grouped together as deficiency needs associated with physiological needs, while the top level is termed growth needs associated with psychological needs. Once these deficiency needs are met, seeking to satisfy growth needs drives personal growth. If a need is satisfied, it is no longer a necessity and allows one to shift to a different level. The higher needs in this hierarchy come into play when the lower needs in the pyramid are satisfied.

Self-actualization, in Maslow's words (1954), is: "The desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming" (pp. 91-92). This model served as a good basis from which early researchers could develop job satisfaction theories.

Whaba and Bridwell (1974) did an extensive review of the research findings on the need hierarchy concept. The results of their review indicate that there was no clear

evidence showing that human needs are classified into five categories, or that these categories are structured in a special hierarchy. Yet, Maslow's theory has wide acceptance.

Motivation-Hygiene Theory is a theory proposed by Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman (1959), also known as the *Two Factor Theory* of job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. created a two-dimensional model of factors affecting people's attitudes about work. According to his theory, people are influenced by two factors:

Satisfaction is primarily the result of the *motivator factors*. These factors help increase satisfaction but have little effect on dissatisfaction.

Dissatisfaction is primarily the result of hygiene factors. These factors, if absent or inadequate, cause dissatisfaction, but their presence has little effect on long-term satisfaction.

Motivating factors are those aspects of the job that make people want to perform, and provide people with satisfaction. These motivating factors are considered to be intrinsic to the job or the work carried out. He concluded that factors such as company policy, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and salary are hygiene factors rather than motivators. According to the theory, the absence of hygiene factors can create job dissatisfaction, but their presence does not motivate or create satisfaction.

In contrast, Herzberg et al. determined from the data that the motivators were elements that enriched a person's job; he found five factors in particular that were strong determinants of job satisfaction: achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility,

and advancement. These motivators (satisfiers) were associated with long-term positive effects in job performance while the hygiene factors (dissatisfiers) consistently produced only short-term changes in job attitudes and performance, which quickly fell back to previous levels.

While Herzberg et al.'s model has stimulated much research; researchers have been unable to reliably empirically prove the model. Hackman and Oldham (1975) suggested that Herzberg's original formulation of the model may have been a methodological artifact. Furthermore, the theory does not consider individual differences, conversely predicting all employees will react in an identical manner to changes in motivating/hygiene factors. Finally, the model has been criticized in that it does not specify how motivating/hygiene factors are to be measured.

Douglas McGregor (1960) proposed two sets of assumptions a manager can hold about human motivation, Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X assumptions are the following:

The average person dislikes working and will avoid it if possible.

People must be directed, controlled, and pressured because people dislike working.

The average person is more interested in security, has little ambition and avoids responsibility.

According to McGregor, managers holding Theory X assumptions, give little latitude to their workers, supervise them closely, punish poor performance, and give only negative feedback.

Theory Y assumptions are the following:

Work is as natural as play and the average worker does not dislike work.

External control is not required when a person is committed to a set of goals.

Goal commitment follows from the satisfaction of a person's desire to achieve.

Lack of ambition is not a basic human characteristic and an average person can learn to accept responsibility.

Creativity, ingenuity, and imagination are human characteristics that are widely dispersed in the population.

Modern organizations only partially use the worker's potentialities.

Managers who hold Theory Y assumptions have a positive view of people believe they have much hidden potential, and believe that people will work toward organizational goals. These managers rely on self-motivation rather than coercion.

Edwin A. Locke's Range of Affect Theory (1976) is arguably the most famous job satisfaction model. The main premise of this theory is that satisfaction is determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. Further, the theory states that how much one values a given facet of work (e.g. the degree of

autonomy in a position) moderates how satisfied/dissatisfied one becomes when expectations are/aren't met. When a person values a particular facet of a job, his satisfaction is more greatly impacted both positively (when expectations are met) and negatively (when expectations are not met), compared to one who doesn't value that facet. To illustrate, if Employee A values autonomy in the workplace and Employee B is indifferent about autonomy, then Employee A would be more satisfied in a position that offers a high degree of autonomy and less satisfied in a position with little or no autonomy compared to Employee B. This theory also states that too much of a particular facet will produce stronger feelings of dissatisfaction the more a worker values that facet.

Job Characteristics Model (JCM), proposed by Hackman and Oldham (1975), is widely used as a framework to study how particular job characteristics impact on job outcomes, including job satisfaction. The model states that there are five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) which impact three critical psychological states (experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of the actual results), in turn influencing work outcomes (job satisfaction, absenteeism, work motivation, etc.). The five core job characteristics can be combined to form a motivating potential score (MPS) for a job, which can be used as an index of how likely a job is to affect an employee's attitudes and behaviors. The model was developed as a response to the shortcomings of Frederick Herzberg's two factor theory.

Expectancy Theory is about choice. It explains the processes an individual undergoes to make choices. In organizational behavior study, expectancy theory is a

Better job performance will lead to organizational rewards, such as an increase in salary or benefits.

These predicted organizational rewards are valued by the employee in question.

Vroom's (1964) theory assumes that behavior results from conscious choices among alternatives whose purpose it is to maximize pleasure and minimize pain. Together with Edward Lawler and Lyman Porter, Vroom suggested that the relationship between people's behavior at work and their goals was not as simple as was first imagined by other scientists. Vroom realized that an employee's performance is based on individual factors such as personality, skills, knowledge, experience and abilities.

Equity Theory, also known as Adams' Equity Theory, attempts to explain relational satisfaction in terms of perceptions of fair/unfair distributions of resources within interpersonal relationships. It was first developed in 1965 by John Stacy Adams, a workplace and behavioral psychologist, who asserted that employees seek to maintain equity between the inputs they bring to a job and the outcomes that they receive from it against the perceived inputs and outcomes of others (Adams, 1965).

Adams' Equity Theory calls for a fair balance to be struck between an employee's inputs (hard work, skill level, tolerance, enthusiasm, etc.) and an employee's outputs (salary, benefits, intangibles such as recognition, etc.). According to the theory, finding this fair balance serves to ensure a strong and productive relationship is achieved with the employee, with the overall result being contented, motivated employees.

“Equity theory is based on the phenomenon of social comparison. Adams argues that when people gauge the fairness of their work outcomes relative to others, any perceived inequity is a motivating state of mind. Perceived inequity occurs when someone believes that the rewards received for their work contributions compare unfavorably to the rewards other people appear to have received for their work. When such perceived inequity exists, the theory states people will be motivated to act in ways that remove the discomfort and restore a sense of felt equity” (Hunt, p.115).

Clayton Alderfer's ERG (Existence, Relatedness, Growth) Theory is built upon Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory. Clayton Alderfer's revision of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, called the ERG Theory, appeared in *Psychological Review* in an article entitled "An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Need." Alderfer's contribution to scientific management was dubbed the ERG theory (Existence, Relatedness, and Growth), and was created to align Maslow's motivational theory more closely with empirical research.

To begin his theory, Alderfer (1972) collapses Maslow's five levels of needs into three categories.

Existence needs are desires for physiological and material well-being. (In terms of Maslow's model, existence needs include physiological and safety needs.)

Relatedness needs are desires for satisfying interpersonal relationships. (In terms of Maslow's model, relatedness correspondence to social needs.)

Growth needs are desires for continued psychological growth and development. (In terms of Maslow's model, growth needs include esteem and self-realization needs.)

This approach proposes that unsatisfied needs motivate behavior, and as lower level needs are satisfied, they become less important. Higher level needs, though, become more important as they are satisfied, and if these needs are not met, a person may move down the hierarchy, which Alderfer (1972) calls the *frustration-regression principle*. What he means by this term is that an already satisfied lower level need can become reactivated and influence behavior when a higher level need cannot be satisfied. As a result, managers should provide opportunities for workers to capitalize on the importance of higher level needs.

This theory is similar to Maslow's (1943) theory because it also deals with human needs. However, the ERG Theory differs from Maslow's theory in three basic respects. "First, the theory collapses Maslow's five need categories into three: existence needs, relatedness needs, and growth needs (Hunt et al. 2000, p112)." The second difference is that "Maslow's theory argues that individuals progress up the 'needs' hierarchy, while the ERG theory emphasizes a unique frustration-regression component (Hunt et al. 2000, p112)." The third difference is that "unlike Maslow's Theory, the ERG Theory contends that more than one need may be activated at the same time" (Hunt et al. 2000, p112).

Dispositional Theory is another well-known job satisfaction theory. It is a very general theory that suggests people have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies toward a certain level of satisfaction, regardless of one's job. This approach became a notable explanation of job satisfaction in light of evidence that job satisfaction tends to be stable over time and across careers and jobs. Research also indicates that identical twins have similar levels of job satisfaction.

Self-evaluation Model is a significant model that narrowed the scope of the Dispositional Theory was proposed by Judge, Locke, Durham and Kluger in 1998. Judge et al. argued that there are four Core Self-evaluations that determine one's disposition towards job satisfaction: self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism. This model states that higher levels of self-esteem (the value one places on one's self) and general self-efficacy (the belief in one's own competence) lead to higher work satisfaction. Having an internal locus of control (believing one has control over her/his own life, as opposed to outside forces having control) leads to higher job satisfaction. Finally, lower levels of neuroticism lead to higher job satisfaction.

In the last several decades, scholars and researchers have analyzed the causes and consequences of job satisfaction. James O' Toole and Edward E. Lawler III (2006) summed up the findings as follows:

Turnover and absenteeism are due to low levels of job satisfaction.

Job performance is more likely to be a cause of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is primarily determined by the type and amount of rewards people get at work (as compared to what they feel they should receive).

Workers develop their perceptions of what they should receive by comparing their rewards to what others like them receive.

A positive relationship exists between customer satisfaction in some service situations and job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction and the desire of employees to form a union are inversely related.

Given all the research on job satisfaction, there is no standard measure of it. Thus, it is difficult to compare the results from one study of job satisfaction to another. While many surveys of job satisfaction have been conducted over the years, they seldom have been repeated. Hence, there is little solid, scientific information on the degree to which levels of job satisfaction have changed (O'Toole and Lawler, 2006).

Studies on School Superintendent Job Satisfaction

The history of the school superintendent can be described as a long journey from manager to leader over the last 200 years. The role has changed merely from responding to local needs for school administration, to leading a multifaceted community learning endeavor. Superintendents lead one of the largest establishments in a community and they have tremendous responsibilities in town. It is a position that is widely influential but not well known or properly understood.

There are several studies performed in the area of job satisfaction of school superintendents.

Manning (1976) in the study of Virginia superintendents used Herzberg's theories. Achievement, recognition, responsibility and the possibility of growth were identified as "motivator factors" and the district policy and interpersonal relations were identified as "hygiene factors."

Cochran's (1976) study involved superintendents in California and identified factors leading to either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Community relations, staff relationships, school improvement/progress and intrinsic feeling of doing a good job were the factors of job satisfaction. The major aspects that resulted in job dissatisfaction were teacher collective bargaining and contract negotiations, fiscal issues, legislative restrictions, school board conflicts and community pressure. In order to attract more efficient and productive individuals for superintendent's position, Cochran called for increased studies of job satisfaction of school superintendents. Defining the factors attributing to superintendent job satisfaction and dissatisfaction would result in a future with more school superintendents satisfied with their jobs.

Reisler (1977) studied 30 superintendents in three New England states to determine the effects of work on the personal life of the superintendent. He concluded that a large majority of superintendents are satisfied with their jobs, but expressed dissatisfaction with the way the job drained them of energy needed for health and non-professional growth.

Chand (1982) study of Alaska's 52 school superintendents revealed that their levels of satisfaction in several aspects of their jobs were affected by several task variables, in contrast to the findings of an earlier nationwide study. A personal-experiential instrument, a task variables instrument, and the Job Descriptive Index were used to obtain

data. These data were subjected to canonical correlation analysis and multiple regression/correlation analysis. The study found 21 task variables that were related to the Alaskan superintendents' overall job satisfaction, 10 variables related to work satisfaction, 4 variables related to satisfaction with coworkers, 9 variables related to satisfaction with the way superintendents were supervised, and 5 variables related to satisfaction with pay. No significant relationships were found between either personal-experiential variables or demographic characteristics and job satisfaction.

Nelson (1987) did a study of job satisfaction of Nebraska school superintendents. A total of 109 of the 125 Nebraska school superintendents responded to a survey that included the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and requested demographic information. The study revealed that the general satisfaction scores of the Nebraska school superintendents were comparable to the average scores of the norm groups established for the MSQ. The analysis of the 20 constructs of the MSQ indicated that Nebraska school superintendents found the least satisfaction in the opportunity for advancement, the ability of their board to make good decisions, and the lack of recognition they received from their board for a job well done. The areas superintendents found the most satisfaction were in their ability to be of service to others, the opportunity to be able to do things that did not go against their conscience, and the ability to do things on their own. Although a statistical difference existed between the salary of Nebraska school superintendents and the general satisfaction score on the MSQ, little practical significance was established.

Whitsell (1987) conducted research using the MSQ to study the job satisfaction of 866 Texas superintendents. Satisfaction was derived from the ability to do things for

others, to do things that did not go against personal values, and the feeling of accomplishment. The least satisfying factors were the possibility of advancement, the amount of praise received, salary, and skill of the board.

Adcock (1991) studied 326 superintendents in Arkansas and concluded that variables of education, longevity in position, size of district, number of superintendencies held and type of school district do not have significant variance on choice of job satisfiers among superintendents. Age was the only variable showing significant variance. In addition, significant differences were found in the satisfaction factors.

Decker and Else (1991) conducted a study of superintendents in Iowa. Nearly 29% of 368 Iowa superintendents responding reported they were less satisfied in their current position than they would like to be or were dissatisfied to the point of feeling a need to leave the superintendency. When asked to identify the two most prevalent reasons for their dissatisfaction, 11 % listed interference by the Board of Education in day to day operations of the school. Twenty-six percent said a source of conflict with the board was the board's efforts to try to manage the district.

Wesson and Grady (1994) did a study of the descriptors of the work lives of women superintendents in urban areas. The variables of interest were perceived sources of job satisfaction, personal benefits of the job, self-fulfillment, and personal strengths that they bring to the job. The study indicates that women urban superintendents use collegial approaches in highly bureaucratic/structured systems.

Malanowski (1999) studied 63 urban superintendents in New Jersey using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al. 1977). It was noted that the urban superintendents in New Jersey reported degrees of satisfaction from satisfied to very

satisfied with all aspects of their job, except tenure. All intrinsic factors such as social service, ability utilization, variety responsibility, creativity, achievement, and social status were rated very satisfied.

Glass et al. (2000) found evidence to support the widely-held belief that the job of superintendent has become increasingly complex, with salary and benefits insufficient for the level of responsibility and accountability demanded. However, superintendents polled by Cooper and Carella (2000) have surmised that improved pay and benefits would possibly attract and retain more qualified individuals in the superintendent profession.

According to the Colorado Association of School Executives (CASE, 2003), the role of superintendent is labor intensive, often requiring 80 or more hours a week. In regard to superintendent self-perception of effectiveness, lack of fiscal resources was cited as a major reason for inhibiting superintendent effectiveness (CASE, 2003) and for explaining why superintendents are leaving the profession (Glass et al., 2000). In the *American Association of School Administrators Study* by Glass et al., superintendents described efforts to obtain sufficient fiscal resources as a never-ending struggle. Too many insignificant demands from various stakeholders and compliance with increased state-mandated reforms were also provided by superintendents as a key factor in hindering superintendent effectiveness.

A study by Solomon (2004) determined that the level of job satisfaction was high among the affluent district superintendents in New Jersey, but the political, social and financial constraints that impact satisfaction continue to grow. This study aligns with the work of Malanowski (1999).

Byrd, Drews and Johnson (2006) published a study that examined the contributing factors influencing superintendent tenure among Texas public school superintendents. The results of the Cox Regression Analysis revealed that strained relationships with the school board president, not being able to get decisions made at the board level, and superintendent/school board communication and relations were significant factors in determining the length of tenure among Texas public school superintendents. More specifically, as the level of difficulty increased by a factor of one (scale 1-5) between the superintendent and school board president's working relationship, the odds of a superintendent staying in the same district decreased by 22.2% ($p = 0.003$). Further, superintendents frustrated about not being able to work with the school board to make decisions at the board level were 1.3 times more likely to leave their position when compared to those who maintained a cooperative relationship with their board ($p = 0.019$). Communication between school board members and superintendents was an additional contributing factor that impacted superintendent tenure. As superintendents' ratings of difficulty regarding superintendent/school board communications increased, the odds of the superintendent staying in the same district decreased by approximately 10% ($p = 0.048$). This study highlighted factors contributing to superintendent turnover, revealing similar findings to nationwide studies completed on superintendent tenure.

School Board and Public School Superintendent Relationships

The school board's most important decision is its selection of a superintendent. Conflicts between the board and the superintendent can occur like in any other relationship. If a major problem occurs between the superintendent and the board member(s), it rapidly filters through the organization, schools and community, creating

ambiguity in district direction and leadership. If a conflict cannot be resolved, it is likely there will be a change in superintendency by nonrenewal, dismissal, buyout or retirement.

Board relationships are a continuing issue for district leaders. Despite theoretical clarity in the division of labor (the board sets policy and the superintendent executes it), the practical application is much more ambiguous. Although boards accept most of their administrators' policy recommendations (Glass et al., 2000), superintendents have to work hard to frame issues in a way that will garner majority support. Whereas 93 percent of the superintendents Glass (2000) surveyed reported a collaborative relationship with the board, 70 percent believed the current governance structure should be restructured or replaced.

The relationship between a board and superintendent establishes a model for the district environment. A cooperative and harmonious relationship will make district employees feel secure as expectations are clear, roles are clarified, and ambiguity does not exist. Conflict between the superintendent and board creates tension. It discourages program innovation and reform and constructive community participation in the schools. It certainly can be critical to any budget, bond or other referenda attempts. Unfortunately, many districts are not practical in meeting the challenge of board and superintendent relations.

In a related study of boards of education, the Institute for Educational Leadership in Washington, D.C. (as cited in Olson, 1992) collected data from individuals serving on nearly 300 school boards in 16 states. Board members indicated that they involve themselves too much in day to day management of schools and have weak procedures for handling conflicts with their superintendents.

It is not surprising that the relationship between superintendents and boards of education has become frayed. "The current pressures to improve schools and increase their accountability to the public have been one of this century's longest and most sustained periods of national attention," according to Stanford professor, Larry Cuban (as cited in Goldstein, 1992, p. 15). He further noted the attention has been all negative. Often, boards of education and superintendents are viewed as the persons responsible for American education that does not fare well in world comparisons, higher taxes, a struggling economy, and a host of other educational ills. The superintendent is caught in the middle of a political vice keeping the bureaucracy satisfied and the board satisfied (Goldstein). In addition, state legislatures are bringing ever increasing pressure on boards of education and superintendents to transform schools, usually without providing additional funds to meet these responsibilities (Seaton, Underwood, & Fortune, 1992).

While the potential for strain is great, the board/superintendent relationship does more to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of education in schools than any other single factor. Further, it is posited that the relationship between and among board members and the superintendent is healthier when all parties discuss and resolve misunderstandings and disagreements that precede serious conflict. However, as Costallo, Greco, and McGowan (1992) noted, ". . . that's easier said than done-neither school board members nor superintendents are trained to perform such a process" (p. 32).

In an effort to assist boards and superintendents in opening communication, building understanding, and resolving conflict, 50 Iowa superintendents, board members, and university faculty came to the University of Northern Iowa campus to examine critical issues, identify options for resolution of issues, and recommend strategies for

strengthening board/superintendent relationships in Iowa schools. Individuals were selected based on their keen interest in school leadership, their skills as communicators, and their enthusiasm toward exploring board/superintendent relations in the interactive environment characteristic of the working conference format. The purpose of the conference was to develop an action agenda to assist schools in strengthening board/superintendent relations.

Each participant selected 1 of 6 issue areas for in depth discussion: (a) building mutual trust and understanding; (b) developing an understanding of roles and expectations of the board of education and the superintendent of schools; (c) building a shared vision that focuses on student needs for the future; (d) ensuring long term communication flow within and between the board of education and the superintendent; (e) making effective decisions, including emphasis on consensus building, conflict resolution, and learning together; and (f) developing positive links with the community (Decker & Else, 1991).

Mountford (2004) in her qualitative study of school board-superintendent relationships explored motivations for school board membership and conceptions of power held by school board members. The findings of the study noted a relationship exists between the way board members define power and the type of motivation board members have for service. The implications of these findings for school board-superintendent relationships were also discussed. The study suggests new concepts for board training and within superintendent leadership preparation programs so that board members and superintendents can develop healthier relationships.

Measurement of Job Satisfaction

There are many methods for measuring job satisfaction. The most common method for collecting data regarding job satisfaction is the Likert scale (named after Rensis Likert). Other less common methods of for gauging job satisfaction include: yes/no questions, true/false questions, point systems, checklists, and forced choice answers. According to Spector (1997) using scales to measure job satisfaction has advantages and disadvantages. Scales often include the major facets of job satisfaction and have been used for a long period of time so that they are able to provide norms, acceptable levels of reliability and validity. The disadvantage can be the scales limit the facets to those that are in the instrument and, the facets can be general in nature.

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI), created by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), is a specific questionnaire of job satisfaction that has been widely used. It measures one's satisfaction in five facets: pay, promotions and promotion opportunities, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself. The scale is simple, participants answer either "yes," "no," "or can't decide" (indicated by "?") in response to whether given statements accurately describe one's job. The entire scale contains 72 items, with 9 or 18 items per subscale. The research shows that JDI provides good validity for this instrument. However, the number of facets (5) is considered limited and viewed as a drawback.

The Job in General Scale (JIG) (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, and Paul, 1989) is an overall measurement of job satisfaction. It was an improvement to the Job Descriptive Index because the JDI focused too much on individual facets and not enough on work satisfaction in general. The scale contains 18 items in a short phrase about the

job in general. The total score is a combination of all items. A three-point scale using “agree,” “aren’t sure,” and “disagree” is used, and negatively worded items are reverse scored (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson and Paul, 1989). Although the Job in General Scale (JIG) has good internal consistency reliability, it is designed to assess overall job satisfaction rather than facets.

The Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) (Hackman and Oldman, 1975) is used to study job characteristics of people. It contains a variety of sub-scales to measure the nature of the job and the job tasks, motivation, personality, psychological states, and reactions to the job. A 7 point scale is used ranging from “extremely dissatisfied” to “extremely satisfied” (Hackman and Oldman, 1975). The job facets included in this instrument are growth, pay, security, supervision, and overall satisfaction.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1985) assesses nine facets of job satisfaction and also assesses overall satisfaction. JSS is a 36 item questionnaire that measures nine facets of job satisfaction. Each of the nine facet subscales includes four items and by combining all of the items, a total satisfaction score can be computed. In order to evaluate a scale, two types of reliability estimates are important, namely, internal consistency reliability estimate and test-retest reliability. The JSS has been shown to correlate with a number of scales and variables with other job satisfaction scales (Spector, 1985).

Other job satisfaction questionnaires include: the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, England, and Lofquist, 1977), the Faces Scale, and the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Subscale (Cammann, Fichman,

Jenkins and Klesh, 1979). The MSQ measures job satisfaction in 20 facets and has a long form with 100 questions (5 items from each facet) and a short form with 20 questions (1 item from each facet). The Faces Scale of job satisfaction, one of the first scales used widely, measured overall job satisfaction with just one item which participants respond to by choosing a face. Finally, the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins & Klesh, 1979) contains a three-item overall satisfaction subscale. It is reported to have an internal consistency reliability of coefficients .77 to .87.

Some of the studies adapted acceptable survey instruments to collect data for their research (Johnson & Holdaway, 1994; Miskel, et al, 1975). Although they are modeled after acceptable instruments, adapted surveys need to be tested for reliability and validity. Some of the studies (Malone, et al, 2000; Wright & Custer, 1998) used created survey instruments. New survey instruments created need to be tested for reliability and validity.

The researcher has identified a questionnaire to collect the data for this study. The advantages of a questionnaire are: answers can be quantified because the respondent is doing the coding to the fixed responses; responses can be summarized, aggregated, and submitted for statistical analysis; they are easy to use with large samples; they are cost effective; they can be scored easier than an interview and they can secure large amounts of data from an individual (Lawler, Nadler & Cammann, 1980).

Lombardo (2005) in his study of job satisfaction among high school principals in Pennsylvania noted that a number of studies used a highly acceptable survey instrument to collect data because of proven reliability and validity of the instrument. These

instruments included the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ).

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form, Weiss et al., 1977) was chosen to measure superintendents' general satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, and extrinsic satisfaction. Spector (1997) noted that the MSQ had been very popular among researchers and more specific than the JDI or JSS. The MSQ has been used far more frequently than any other instruments mentioned above in the last 30 years (Malanowski, 1999). It was used in the study of job satisfaction among superintendents in New Jersey by Richard O' Malley (2004) and also by Gene M. Solomon (2004). The MSQ comes in two forms, a 100-item long version and a 20-item short form. It covers 20 facets, many of which are more specific than most other satisfaction scales. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form measures three scales: intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction. The MSQ short form is composed of twenty different items. The Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) includes documentation regarding the instrument's construct, concurrent, and content validities. The Manual for the MSQ speaks to reliability and validity. The MSQ short form has a high reliability coefficient ranging from .87 to .92. The general satisfaction scores yielded a coefficient of .89 in test-retest correlation over a 1-week period and .70 over a 1-year period. The median reliability coefficient for intrinsic satisfaction is .86, for extrinsic satisfaction is .80, and for general satisfaction is .90. Since the short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is based on a subset of the long-form items, validity for the short-form may in part be inferred from validity for the long form. Other evidence for the validity of the short-form MSQ is available from two sources: (a) studies of occupational

group differences and (b) studies of the relationship between satisfaction and satisfactoriness, as specified by the Theory of Adjustment (Dawis, & Lofquist, 1984). Spector (1997) stated that several studies had reported acceptable internal consistency reliabilities for the short form for the extrinsic, intrinsic, and total scores.

The researcher has also chosen a second instrument to ascertain the relationship between a school board and a superintendent. The instrument is the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) sponsored 10-year studies that have proven to be seminal works in literature discussing the American school superintendent. For over 80 years, these studies have provided an extensive database describing superintendent demographics, board relations, professional development, districts, and career paths (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). These studies have become a primary national source document about superintendents and extensively used by researchers, national and state policymakers, and others interested in the nation's school leadership. These studies were conducted approximately every 10 years since 1923.

The American Association of School Administrators' 2006 *State of the Superintendency Survey* has targeted a set of key content areas important to the superintendency (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). They are as follows:

Superintendent career paths and preparations

Superintendent working conditions

Superintendent evaluation and contracts

Superintendent/board relations

Superintendent demographics

This researcher will be using the part of the survey questions pertaining to superintendent/board relations. The researcher has been granted permission to use the *2006 State of the Superintendency Survey* (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine the overall job satisfaction, the level of intrinsic job satisfaction, the level of extrinsic job satisfaction and school board relationships of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York.

The study determined the level of relationship between overall job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) and the impact of selected factors of age, gender, salary level, years of experience, levels of education, and district size. The study examined the following: (a) Whether there were statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents *between* Nassau County and Suffolk County (Long Island) in New York, (b) Whether there were statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey, and (c) Whether there were statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey.

In addition, the study further examined the level of relationship between a school board and a superintendent of all public schools in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and determine if there were any significant differences in the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau

and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*) in comparison to *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study by American Association of School Administrators* (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

Chapter III describes the sample population, instrumentation, data collection, and the description of data analysis.

Population

There are 125 public school districts in Long Island, 56 school districts in Nassau County and 69 school districts in Suffolk County. The population of this study included all 125 public school superintendents of both Nassau and Suffolk Counties for the school year 2007/2008. The source of the sample was a list of all school districts provided by the New York State Education Department website and the Nassau and Suffolk Council of School Superintendents Association Directory.

Procedure

The researcher mailed all public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), in New York, (after approval by the Institutional Review Board), a packet containing a cover letter, a numbered demographic survey, a numbered Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form), a numbered School Board Relationship Questionnaire, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope.

The cover letter (see Appendix A) was designed to seek voluntary cooperation from the respondents/superintendents. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study, identified the researcher and the university, and instructions to complete and return the requested information. The cover letter further noted that all responses would be kept confidential and that no superintendents would be identified in the study.

The demographic survey (see Appendix B) requested information regarding the respondent's location of the district, type of district, structure of district, size of the district (student enrollment), gender, age, whether or not the respondent has a doctorate, annual salary, total number of years as a superintendent, and number of years in the current position. Respondents had the option to check if they wished to receive a copy of the results. A follow-up mailing will be sent to the superintendents who had not responded to the initial mailing, after a two or three week period. Names and addresses of respondents were optional. Approval to conduct the study was obtained from Seton Hall University's Institutional Review Board.

Instrumentation

Several instruments that were examined that measured both overall job satisfaction and facet job satisfaction.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form, Weiss et al., 1977) was chosen to measure superintendents' general satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, and extrinsic satisfaction. The MSQ has been used far more frequently than any other instruments mentioned above in the last 30 years (Malanowski, 1999). It was used in the

study of job satisfaction among superintendents in New Jersey by Richard O' Malley (2004) and also by Gene M. Solomon (2004). Approval to use the revised version (1977) of the MSQ was obtained from the University of Minnesota, Department of Psychology, Vocational Psychology Research.

The MSQ is a paper and pencil inventory of the extent to which both vocational needs and values are satisfied on the job. The MSQ is gender neutral, can be administered to groups or to individuals, and is appropriate for use with individuals who can read at the fifth grade level or higher. Instructions for the administration of the MSQ are given in the questionnaire booklet. The 20 responses on the MSQ are scored using a 5-point Likert scale: very satisfied (5-VS), satisfied (4-S), neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3-N), dissatisfied (2-DS), and very dissatisfied (1-VDS). The MSQ Short Form takes 10 minutes to complete (see Appendix C). The 20 items, which are used to measure general job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction, are as follows:

General Satisfaction

Supervision-human relations: The way my boss handles his/her employees.

Supervision-technical: The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.

The addition of *all* items from the intrinsic and extrinsic scales listed below.

Intrinsic Job Satisfaction

Ability utilization: The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.

Achievement: The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

Activity: Being able to keep busy all the time.

Advancement: The chances for advancement on this job.

Compensation: My pay and the amount of work I do.

Co-workers: The way my co-workers get along with each other.

Creativity: The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.

Independence: The chance to work alone on the job.

Moral values: Being able to do things that do not go against my conscience.

Social service: The chance to do things for other people.

Social status: The chance to be “somebody” in the community.

Working conditions: The working conditions.

Extrinsic Satisfaction

Authority: The chance to tell other people what to do.

Company policies and practices: The way company policy and practices are put into practice.

Recognition: The praise I get for doing a good job.

Responsibility: The freedom to use my own judgment.

Security: The way my job provides for steady employment.

Variety: The chance to do different things from time to time.

The MSQ short form provides three sub-scores: (a) general job satisfaction, (b) extrinsic job satisfaction, and (c) intrinsic job satisfaction. The general satisfaction sub-score is a measure of the work and the environment based on the intrinsic items, extrinsic items, and two general items (Weiss et al., 1977). The intrinsic sub-score is a measure of job satisfaction with the work itself. The extrinsic sub-score is a measure of job satisfaction with the work environment.

Spector (1997) indicated that job satisfaction research is mostly done with questionnaires. The MSQ-short form has been used in several job satisfaction studies in education. Among these were Weiss (1968), Hull (1974), Schnet (1976), Brown (1978), Schaefer (1982), Whitsell (1987), Malanowski (1999), O'Malley (2004) and Solomon (2004).

The Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1977) includes documentation regarding the instrument's construct, concurrent, and content validities. The manual for the MSQ speaks to reliability and validity. The MSQ short

form has a high reliability coefficient ranging from .87 to .92. The general satisfaction scores yielded a coefficient of .89 in test-retest correlation over a 1-week period and .70 over a 1-year period. The median reliability coefficient for intrinsic satisfaction is .86, for extrinsic satisfaction is .80, and for general satisfaction is .90. Since the short-form MSQ is based on a subset of the long-form items, validity for the short-form may in part be inferred from validity for the long form. Other evidence for the validity of the short-form MSQ is available from two sources: (a) studies of occupational group differences and (b) studies of the relationship between satisfaction and satisfactoriness, as specified by the Theory of Adjustment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984).

The MSQ consists of four pages. Page 4 consists of questions relating to general demographic characteristics of respondents. This page will be replaced with a data form that is more appropriate for this study.

The researcher had also chosen a second instrument to ascertain the relationship of a school board and a superintendent. The instrument was the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) 10-year studies have proven to be seminal works in literature discussing the American school superintendent. For over 80 years, these studies have provided an extensive database describing superintendent demographics, board relations, professional development, districts, and career paths (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). These studies have become a primary national source document about superintendents and extensively used by researchers, national and state

policymakers and others interested in the nation's school leadership. These studies were conducted approximately every 10 years since 1923.

The American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey* has targeted a set of key content areas important to the superintendency and includes the following:

Superintendent career paths and preparations

Superintendent working conditions

Superintendent evaluation and contracts

Superintendent/board relations

Superintendent demographics

This researcher used the part of the survey questions pertaining to superintendent and school board relations. The researcher has been granted permission to use the 2006 *State of the Superintendency Survey* (see Appendix D).

Data Analysis

Data analysis was made on the responses from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Three scores were generated: a general satisfaction score, an intrinsic satisfaction score, and an extrinsic satisfaction score. Responses to the individual questions ranged from a high 5 to a low 1 (5 being very satisfied/1 being very dissatisfied). Mean scores and standard deviations were compiled and determined. Using

t-tests, the data were analyzed to look at the relationship of age, gender, salary, years of experience as a superintendent, and district size (student population) to general satisfaction, to intrinsic satisfaction, and to extrinsic satisfaction. In addition, t-tests were performed to ascertain if there exists a statistically significant difference in the satisfaction factors between public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, public school superintendents in Hunterdon & Somerset Counties in New Jersey, and public school superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) public school districts in New Jersey.

In addition, the relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey* was assessed. As compared to 2006 *State of the Superintendency Study*, Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio tests were utilized to ascertain if there were any significant differences in the relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' 2006 *State of the Superintendency Survey*).

Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

As noted in Chapter I, the purpose of this study is to determine the overall job satisfaction and school board relationships of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York. Chapter IV discusses the findings from the analysis of the data obtained from the study. The data report is divided into four parts. The first part contains demographic data of the superintendents in the study. The second part includes descriptive and inferential statistics derived from the results from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire that addresses the research questions. The third section reports the descriptive and inferential statistics derived from the results from the board-superintendent relationships survey of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*), including a comparison to *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study by American Association of School Administrators (2007)*. Part four addresses the research questions and the findings from the analysis of the data obtained. Part five provides supplemental research from the study.

The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the overall level of satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?
2. What is the level of intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York?

3. What is the level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York?

4. What is the level of relationship between overall job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and the impact of factors such as age, gender, salary level, years of experience, levels of education, and the school district size?

5. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents between Nassau County and Suffolk County (Long Island) in New York?

6. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

7. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey?

8. What is the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York, using the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*?

9. Are there any significant differences in the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*) in comparison to *The State*

of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study by American Association of School Administrators (2007)?

Demographics

A total of 125 superintendents from Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York were surveyed. Responses were received from 68 districts, constituting a 54% response rate. A total of 33 districts responded in Nassau County out of 56 school districts, representing a response rate of 59%. A total of 35 districts responded in Suffolk County out of 69 school districts, representing a response rate of 51%. Respondents completed a demographic survey that included location of the district, type of district, structure of district, student enrollment, gender, age, doctorate degree, annual salary, number of years as a superintendent, and number of years as a superintendent in the current position.

Age

Ninety-one percent of 68 public school superintendents who participated in the study were 50 years or older. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were between ages 55-64 years. It ranged from a low range of the age distribution category of 35-39 years old ($n=1$, 1.5%) to a high range of the age distribution category of 65 years or older ($n=3$, 4.4%). Table 1 provides a frequency distribution of the age of responding superintendents.

Table 1

Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Age

Age	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative%
34 years or younger	0	0	0
35-39	1	1.5	1.5
40-44	2	2.9	4.4
45-49	3	4.4	8.8
50-54	7	10.3	19.1
55-59	32	47.1	66.2
60-64	20	29.4	95.6
65 yrs. or older	3	4.4	100
Total	68	100	

Gender

There are almost three times as many male superintendents (72%) as there are female superintendents (28) in Nassau and Suffolk Counties among the respondents.

Table 2 provides the distribution of respondents by gender.

Table 2

Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Gender

Gender	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative %
Male	49	72.1	72.1
Female	19	27.9	100
Total	68	100	

Salary

Salary compensation as a public school superintendent in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York ranged from less than \$150,000 ($n=2$, 2.94%), to greater than \$ 275,001($n=4$, 5.9%). 91 % of superintendents ($n=50$) were in the salary range of \$175,000 to \$ 300,000. A frequency distribution of the respondents' salary is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Salary

Salary	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative%
Less than \$150,000	2	2.9	2.9
\$150,001 - \$175,000	4	5.9	8.8
\$175,001 - \$200,000	20	29.4	38.2
\$200,001 - \$225,000	17	25.0	63.2
\$225,001 - \$250,000	13	19.1	82.3
\$250,001 - \$275,000	8	11.8	94.1
\$275,001 - \$300,000	4	5.9	100
\$300,001 – 325,000	0	0	
\$325,001 – 350,000	0	0	
Over \$350,000	0	0	
Total	68	100	

Education – Doctorate

Of the 68 superintendents who participated in this study, 44 had earned a doctorate degree representing 65%, and 35% or 24 superintendents did not have a doctorate degree (see Table 4).

Table 4

Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Doctoral Degree

Doctorate	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative%
Yes	44	64.7	64.7
No	24	35.3	100
Total	68	100.0	

School District Size

Table 5 provides a frequency distribution on size of the district (based on enrollment) in which the public school superintendents were employed. District size ranged from less than 999 students to more than 10,000 students. Over 57% of respondents ($n=39$) worked in school districts between 1000-4999 student enrollments. 59% of respondents ($n=40$) worked in school districts with a student enrollment of over 3000 students.

Table 5

Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by District Size

Size	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative %
1-999	7	10.3	10.3
1000-2999	21	30.9	41.2
3000-4999	18	26.4	67.6
5000-9999	17	25.0	92.6
10,000 – 24,999	5	7.4	100.0
25,000 or more	0	0	
Total	68	100	100

Structure of District

Table 6 provides a frequency distribution on the structure of the district in which the public school superintendents were employed. Most of the respondents were employed in K-12 school structure ($n = 53$, 77.9%), followed by K-6 school structure ($n = 9$, 13.2%).

Table 6

Distribution of Public School Superintendents of District in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Structure

Structure	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative%
K – 6	9	13.2	13.2
K – 8	2	2.9	16.2
K – 12	53	77.9	94.1
7 – 12	2	2.9	97.1
Other	2	2.9	100.0
Total	68	100	

Type of District

Table 7 provides a frequency distribution on the type of the district in which the public school superintendents were employed. Most of the respondents were employed in suburban school districts ($n = 61$, 89.7%), followed by rural districts ($n = 6$, 8.8%).

Table 7

Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Type of District

Type of District	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative %
Urban	1	1.5	1.5
Suburban	61	89.7	91.2
Rural	6	8.8	100.0
Total	68	100	

Number of Years as a Superintendent

Over one-third of superintendents ($n=26$) were new superintendents with less than 3 years experience as a superintendent, and almost two-thirds of superintendents ($n=42$) had 4 or more years of experience as a superintendent.

Table 8

Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Number of Years Experience as a Superintendent

Years	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative %
1-3 years	26	38.2	38.2
4-6 years	14	20.6	58.8
7-9 years	9	13.2	72.1
10-12 years	7	10.3	82.4
13 years or more	12	17.6	100.0
Total	68	100.0	

Number of Years as a Superintendent in the Current Position

Fifty percent of the superintendents ($n=34$) are in the current position for less than 3 years. 27.9% of the responding superintendents ($n=19$) have been in the current position for more than 7 years (see Table 9).

Table 9

Distribution of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York by Number Years of Experience as a Superintendent in the Current Position

Years	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative%
1-3 years	34	50.0	50.0
4-6 years	15	22.1	72.1
7-9 years	11	16.2	88.3
10-12 years	3	4.3	92.6
13 years or more	5	7.4	100.0
Total	68	100.0	

Job Satisfaction Data – Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Short Form)

The short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Glass & Franceschini, 2007) contained a total of 20 questions with superintendents responding on a five-point Likert-type scale. A score of 1 meant Very Dissatisfied (I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job), 2 meant Dissatisfied (I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job), 3 meant N (I cannot decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job), 4 meant Satisfied (I am satisfied with this aspect of my job), and 5 meant Very Satisfied (I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job). Data from the respondents on the MSQ were examined to determine a general job satisfaction score, an intrinsic score, and an extrinsic score.

General Job Satisfaction

The frequency distribution for general job satisfaction is shown in Table 10. It indicates that scores ranged from a low of 56 to a high 100. There were 20 questions

included in this section and a possible score ranging from 20 to 100. The mean general job satisfaction was 83.34 with a standard deviation of 8.29.

Table 10

Distribution of Perceived General Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

General Score	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative%
56	1	1.5	1.5
62	1	1.5	2.9
68	2	2.9	5.9
71	1	1.5	7.4
72	1	1.5	8.8
73	1	1.5	10.3
74	1	1.5	11.8
75	2	2.9	14.7
76	1	1.5	16.2
77	3	4.4	20.6
78	5	7.4	27.9
79	1	1.5	29.4
80	4	5.9	35.3
81	1	1.5	36.8
82	3	4.4	41.2
83	2	2.9	44.1
84	3	4.4	48.5
85	6	8.8	57.3
86	4	5.9	63.2
87	5	7.4	70.6
88	1	1.5	72.1
89	5	7.4	79.4
90	3	4.4	83.8
91	1	1.5	85.3
92	2	2.9	88.2
93	2	2.9	91.2
94	2	2.9	94.1
95	1	1.5	95.6
98	1	1.5	97.1
99	1	1.5	98.5
100	1	1.5	100.0
TOTAL	68	100	

Intrinsic Satisfaction

The frequency distribution for intrinsic job satisfaction is shown in Table 11. It indicates that scores ranged from a low of 37 to a high 60. There were 12 questions included in this section and a possible score ranging from 12 to 60. The mean intrinsic job satisfaction was 52.38 with a standard deviation of 4.63.

Table 11

Distribution of Perceived Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

Intrinsic Score	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative %
37	1	1.5	1.5
41	1	1.5	2.9
44	1	1.5	4.4
45	1	1.5	5.9
46	1	1.5	7.4
47	4	5.9	13.2
48	5	7.4	20.6
49	5	7.4	27.9
50	4	5.9	33.8
51	5	7.4	41.2
52	4	5.9	47.1
53	3	4.4	51.5
54	9	13.2	64.7
55	6	8.8	73.5
56	4	5.9	79.4
57	6	8.8	88.2
58	3	4.4	92.6
59	2	2.9	95.6
60	3	4.4	100.0
TOTAL	68	100.0	

Extrinsic Satisfaction

The frequency distribution for intrinsic job satisfaction is shown in Table 12. It indicates that scores ranged from a low of 13 to a high 30. There were 6 questions included in this

section and a possible score ranging from 6 to 30. The mean extrinsic job satisfaction was 22.53 with a standard deviation of 3.54.

Table 12

Distribution of Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

Extrinsic Score	<i>n</i>	%	Cumulative%
13	1	1.5	1.5
14	1	1.5	2.9
15	1	1.5	4.4
16	1	1.5	5.9
17	2	2.9	8.8
18	4	5.9	14.7
19	3	4.4	19.1
20	2	2.9	22.1
21	6	8.8	30.9
22	9	13.2	44.1
23	12	17.6	61.8
24	9	13.2	75.0
25	4	5.9	80.9
26	5	7.4	88.2
27	3	4.4	92.6
28	2	2.9	95.6
29	2	2.9	98.5
30	1	1.5	100.0
TOTAL	68	100.0	

General Job Satisfaction between Nassau and Suffolk Counties

The frequency distribution for general job satisfaction for Nassau and Suffolk separately is shown in Table 13. It indicates that scores ranged from a low of 56 to a high 100 for Nassau County and from 62 to 95 for Suffolk County superintendents. There were 20 questions included in this section and a possible score ranging from 20 to 100. The mean general job satisfaction for Nassau respondents was 82.55 with a standard deviation of 9.17. The mean general job satisfaction for Suffolk respondents was 84.09 with a standard deviation of 7.43.

Table 13

Distribution of Perceived General Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents Between Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

General Score Nassau	Nassau <i>n</i>	%	Cumulative%	General Score Suffolk	Suffolk <i>n</i>	%	Cumulative%
56	1	3.0	3.0	62	1	2.9	2.9
68	2	6.1	9.1	71	1	2.9	5.8
72	1	3.0	12.1	73	1	2.9	8.7
75	1	3.0	15.2	74	1	2.9	11.6
77	2	6.1	21.2	75	1	2.9	14.5
78	3	9.2	30.4	76	1	2.9	17.4
79	1	3.0	33.4	77	1	2.9	20.3
80	3	9.2	42.6	78	2	5.6	25.9
81	1	3.0	45.6	80	1	2.9	28.8
82	2	6.1	51.7	82	1	2.9	31.7
83	1	3.0	54.7	83	1	2.9	34.6
84	1	3.0	57.7	84	2	5.6	40.2
85	2	6.1	63.8	85	4	11.4	51.6
86	2	6.1	69.9	86	2	5.7	57.3
87	2	6.1	76.0	87	3	8.5	65.8
88	1	3.0	79.0	89	4	11.4	77.2
89	1	3.0	82.0	90	3	8.5	85.7
91	1	3.0	85.0	92	1	2.9	88.6
92	1	3.0	88.0	93	1	2.9	91.5
93	1	3.0	91.0	94	2	5.6	97.1
98	1	3.0	94.0	95	1	2.9	100.0
99	1	3.0	97.0				
100	1	3.0	100.0				
TOTAL	33	100.0		TOTAL	35	100.0	

Intrinsic Job Satisfaction between Nassau and Suffolk Counties

The frequency distribution for intrinsic job satisfaction for Nassau and Suffolk separately is shown in Table 14. It indicates that scores ranged from a low of 37 to a high 60 for Nassau County and from 41 to 59 for Suffolk County superintendents. There were 12 questions included in this section and a possible score ranging from 12 to 60. The mean intrinsic job satisfaction for Nassau respondents was 51.82 with a standard

deviation of 5.12. The mean intrinsic job satisfaction for Suffolk respondents was 52.91 with a standard deviation of 4.12.

Table 14

Distribution of Perceived Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents Between Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

Intrinsic Score Nassau	Nassau <i>n</i>	%	Cumulative %	Intrinsic Score Suffolk	Suffolk <i>n</i>	%	Cumulative %
37	1	3.0	3.0	41	1	2.9	2.9
44	1	3.0	6.1	46	1	2.9	5.7
45	1	3.0	9.1	47	2	5.7	11.4
47	2	6.1	15.2	48	2	5.7	17.1
48	3	9.1	24.2	49	2	5.7	22.9
49	3	9.1	33.3	50	1	2.9	25.7
50	3	9.1	42.4	51	2	5.7	31.4
51	3	9.1	51.5	52	2	5.7	37.1
52	2	6.1	57.6	53	2	5.7	42.9
53	1	3.0	60.6	54	7	20.0	62.9
54	2	6.1	66.7	55	4	11.4	74.3
55	2	6.1	72.7	56	2	5.7	80.0
56	2	6.1	78.8	57	3	8.6	88.6
57	3	9.1	87.9	58	2	5.7	94.3
58	1	3.0	90.9	59	2	5.7	100.0
60	3	9.1	100.0				
TOTAL	33	100.0		TOTAL	35	100.0	

Extrinsic Job Satisfaction between Nassau and Suffolk Counties

The frequency distribution for extrinsic job satisfaction for Nassau and Suffolk separately is shown in Table 15. It indicates that scores ranged from a low of 13 to a high 30 for Nassau County and from 14 to 29 for Suffolk County superintendents. There were six questions included in this section and a possible score ranging from 5 to 30. The mean extrinsic job satisfaction for Nassau respondents was 22.30 with a standard

deviation of 3.61. The mean extrinsic job satisfaction for Suffolk respondents was 22.74 with a standard deviation of 3.51.

Table 15

Distribution of Perceived Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Scores by Superintendents Between Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

Extrinsic Score Nassau	Nassau <i>n</i>	%	Cumulative %	Extrinsic Score Suffolk	Suffolk <i>n</i>	%	Cumulative %
13	1	3.0	3.0	14	1	2.9	2.9
17	2	6.1	9.1	15	1	2.9	5.7
18	2	6.1	15.2	16	1	2.9	8.6
19	2	6.1	21.2	18	2	5.7	14.3
20	1	3.0	24.2	19	1	2.9	17.1
21	5	15.2	39.4	20	1	2.9	20.0
22	4	12.1	51.5	21	1	2.9	22.9
23	4	12.1	63.6	22	5	14.3	37.1
24	5	15.2	78.8	23	8	22.9	60.0
25	1	3.0	81.8	24	4	11.4	71.4
26	3	9.1	90.9	25	3	8.6	80.0
28	1	3.0	93.9	26	2	5.7	85.7
29	1	3.0	97.0	27	3	8.6	94.3
30	1	3.0	100.0	28	1	2.9	97.1
				29	1	2.9	100.0
TOTAL	33	100.0		TOTAL	35	100.0	

Board-Superintendent Relationships Survey

All public school superintendents totaling 125 school districts were surveyed in Nassau (56) and Suffolk (69) Counties in Long Island, New York. Responses were received from 68 districts constituting a 54% response rate. A total of 33 districts responded in Nassau County out of 56 school districts, representing a response rate of 59%. A total of 35 districts responded in Suffolk County out of 69 school districts, representing a response rate of 51%.

A survey instrument adapted from the AASA (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey* pertaining to Board-Superintendent Relationships was sent to the respondents. The respondents completed questions that reflect the level of relationship between the board and a superintendent of public school districts in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. This section reported the data relating to the level of relationship between the board and a superintendent of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and determined if there are any significant differences in the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*) in comparison to *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study* by American Association of School Administrators (2007).

Superintendents' Perspective on How Well Board Leads the District

More than a third (39.7%) of superintendents felt their board lead the district *well*. Almost another third (32.4%) felt boards do *very well* in leading the district. Only 3 superintendents (4.4%) out of 68 felt their boards were leading *poorly or very poorly*. A majority of superintendents feel that their boards lead their districts reasonably well. Table 16 provides a distribution of superintendents' perspective on how well the board led the district in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York.

Table 16

Distribution of Superintendents' Perspective on How Well the Board Leads the District in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Group A 1-999		Group B 1,000- 2,999		Group C 3,000- 4,999		Group D 5,000- 9,999		Group E 10,000- 24,999		Group F Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Very Well	2	28.6	4	19.0	6	33.3	8	47.1	2	40.0	22	32.4
Well	2	28.6	11	52.4	7	38.9	5	29.4	2	40.0	27	39.7
Average	2	28.6	6	28.6	3	16.7	4	23.5	1	20.0	16	23.5
Poorly	1	14.3	-	-	1	5.6	-	-	-	-	2	2.9
Very Poorly	-	-	-	-	1	5.6	--	-	-	-	1	1.5

Board Member Tenure

Superintendents were asked to indicate the number of years they believed were average for their board members to serve. This was not a precise way to measure board member tenure but it does show that over 70% of the respondents indicated that the average tenure of a board member as 6 years, and less than a third noted the average tenure as 5 years or less. In New York, board members serve 3-year terms, indicating that over two-thirds serve a minimum of two terms. Table 17 provides the distribution of the length of time a board member serves in school districts of Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

Table 17

Distribution of the Approximate Length of Time (in years) a Board Member Serves in School Districts of Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

Years	Group A 1-999		Group B 1,000- 2,999		Group C 3,000- 4,999		Group D 5,000- 9,999		Group E 10,000- 24,999		Group F Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	1	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.5
3	1	14.3	3	13.0	3	16.7	3	20.0	2	40.0	12	17.6
4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	-	-	1	1.5
5	-	-	3	13.0	3	16.7	-	-	-	-	6	8.8
6	3	42.9	11	47.8	8	44.4	5	33.3	2	40.0	29	42.6
7	-	-	1	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.5
8	1	14.3	2	8.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	4.4
9	-	-	1	4.3	3	16.7	3	20.0	1	20.0	8	11.8
10 or More	2	28.6	1	4.3	1	5.6	3	20.0	-	-	7	10.3

The Most Important Reason for Being Hired as a Superintendent

Seventy and six tenth percent superintendents ($n=48$) reported that they were hired primarily for *leadership ability*. Ten and three tenths percent superintendents ($n=7$) reported that they were primarily hired for *personal characteristics* such as integrity, honesty, tact, and so forth. Table 18 provides the frequency distribution.

Table 18

Distribution of Superintendents' Opinion on the Most Important Reason for Being Hired in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Group A 1-999		Group B 1,000- 2,999		Group C 3,000- 4,999		Group D 5,000- 9,999		Group E 10,000- 24,999		Group F Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Ability to maintain the status quo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Experience as a change agent	-	-	5	23.8	1	5.6	-	-	-	-	6	8.8
Leadership ability	3	42.9	12	57.1	16	88.9	14	73.7	3	100.0	48	70.6
Management skills (e.g. instruction, personnel, etc.)	1	14.3	2	9.5	-	-	3	15.8	-	-	6	8.8
Personal characteristics (e.g., integrity, honesty, tact, etc.)	2	28.6	2	9.5	1	5.6	2	10.5	-	-	7	10.3
Other	1	14.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.5

Time Spent in Direct Communication with Board Members per Week

Over 50% of superintendents spent less than 5 hours per week and about 45% of superintendents spent 6 hours or more in direct communication with their board.

Table 19

Distribution of Time Spent in Direct Communication with Board Members per Week by the Superintendents' in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

Number of hours	Total	Percent
5 hours or less	37	54.4
6-10 hours	24	35.3
More than 10 hours	7	10.3

Present Relationship with the Board

Ninety seven percent of the superintendents responded that the present relationship with the board as *very good* or *good*. Only two superintendents out of 68 respondents noted their relationship with the board as *poor*. Table 20 provides the distribution of the present relationship with the board.

Table 20

Distribution of Characteristics of Present Relationship with the Board as Responded by the Superintendents' in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

[illegible]

Board's Primary Expectation for Superintendent

As noted in Table 21, 66.2% respondents ($n=45$) indicated that the board's primary expectation for superintendent was being an *educational leader*, followed by 20.6% respondents ($n=14$) indicating as a *managerial leader*.

Table 21

Distribution of Board's Primary Expectation for Superintendent as Perceived by the Superintendents' in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Group A 1-999		Group B 1,000- 2,999		Group C 3,000- 4,999		Group D 5,000- 9,999		Group E 10,000- 24,999		Group F Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Educational leader (e.g., curriculum and instruction, etc.)	6	85.7	15	71.4	13	72.2	7	41.2	4	80.0	45	66.2
Political leader (e.g., board and community relations)	1	14.3	2	9.5	2	11.1	2	11.8	-	-	7	10.3
Managerial leader (e.g., general management, budget, and finance)	-	-	4	19.0	2	11.1	7	41.2	1	20.0	14	20.6
Other	-	-	-	-	1	5.6	1	5.9	-	-	2	2.9

Board Ethics

Over 90% of the responding superintendents indicated that their board acts ethically *all the time or most of the time*. Table 22 provides the distribution of superintendents' perspective of board ethics in Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

Table 22

Distribution of Superintendents' Perspective of Board Ethics in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Group A 1-999		Group B 1,000- 2,999		Group C 3,000- 4,999		Group D 5,000- 9,999		Group E 10,000- 24,999		Group F Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All of the time	2	28.6	14	66.7	7	38.9	9	52.9	2	40.0	34	50.0
Most of The time	4	57.1	7	33.3	10	55.6	8	47.1	3	60.0	32	47.1
Seldom	1	14.3	-	-	1	5.6	-	-	-	-	2	2.9
Never	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Superintendents' Leaving a District Due to Ethical Problems of the Board

Only six superintendents out of 68 indicated leaving a superintendency due to ethical problems involving a board.

Table 23

Distribution of Superintendents 'Leaving a District Due to Ethical Problems in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Group A 1-999		GroupB 1,000- 2,999		GroupC 3,000- 4,999		GroupD 5,000- 9,999		GroupE 10,000- 24,999		GroupF Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
YES	2	33.3	1	4.8	3	15.8	-	-	-	-	6	8.8
NO	4	66.7	20	95.2	16	84.2	17	100.0	5	100.0	62	91.2

Community Support

Fifty eight and eight tenths indicated community support being *very good* and 38.3% noted as *good*. Only 2.9% respondents indicated that community support as *poor*.

Comparison of Board-Superintendent Relationships

This part includes a comparison of data of public school superintendents of Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, to the national data as reported in *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study by American Association of School Administrators (2007)*.

Comparison of How Well the Board Leads the District – Nassau & Suffolk (Long Island) v. AASA Study 2006

Only 4.4% of Long Island superintendents indicated that the board led the district *poorly* or *very poorly*, as compared to AASA Study 2006 of 21.3%.

Table 24

Comparison of Perspective on How Well the Board Leads the District in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and AASA Study 2006

	Nassau Suffolk		AASA 2006	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Very Well	22	32.4	328	24.7
Well	27	39.7	716	54.0
Average	16	23.5	NA	NA
Poorly	2	2.9	221	16.7
Very Poorly	1	1.5	61	4.6

Board Member Tenure

About 6 years is the average tenure of a board member as noted in both the studies of Long Island superintendents and AASA Study 2006. Table 25 provides the tenure comparison by number of years of a board member.

Table 25

Comparison of the Approximate Length of Time (in years) a Board Member Serves in School Districts of Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and the AASA Study 2006

Years	Nassau Suffolk Total		AASA 2006 Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
	-	-	0	0.2
1	1	1.5	22	1.7
2	12	17.6	112	8.4
3	1	1.5	229	17.3
4	6	8.8	110	8.3
5	29	42.6	307	23.2
6	1	1.5	33	2.5
7	3	4.4	246	18.6
8	8	11.8	63	4.8
9				
10 or More	7	10.3	202	15.2

Most Important Reason for Being Hired as a Superintendent

Seventy and six tenth percent of Nassau and Suffolk (Long Island) respondents noted that they were hired for *leadership ability*, which is significantly higher than the AASA Study 2006 of 49.2%.

Table 26

Distribution of Superintendents' Opinion on the Most Important Reason for Being Hired in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Nassau Suffolk Total		AASA 2006 Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Ability to maintain the status quo	-	-	25	1.9
Experience as a change agent	6	8.8	125	9.4
Leadership ability	48	70.6	652	49.2
Management skills (e.g. instruction, personnel, etc.)	6	8.8	186	14.0
Personal characteristics (e.g., integrity, honesty, tact, etc.)	7	10.3	288	21.7
Other	1	1.5	50	3.8

Time Spent in Direct Communication per Week

A majority of superintendents spent 5 hours or less per week in direct communication with board members per week under both studies.

Table 27

Comparison of Time Spent in Direct Communication with Board Members per Week by the Superintendents' in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and AASA Study 2006

	Nassau Suffolk Total		AASA 2006 Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
5 hours or less	43	63.2	990	74.7
6-10 hours	23	33.8	271	20.4
More than 10 hours	2	2.9	65	5.1

Present Relationships with the Board

There is no statistically significant difference in the relationships with the school boards between the Long Island superintendents study and the AASA Study 2006.

Ninety seven percent of Long Island superintendents and 93% of AASA Study 2006 superintendents characterized their relationships with the board as *very good* or *good*.

Table 28

Comparison of Characteristics of Present Relationship with the Board as Responded by the Superintendents' in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Nassau Suffolk Total		AASA 2006 Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Very Good	43	63.2	833	62.8
Good	23	33.8	401	30.2
Poor	2	2.9	68	5.1
Very Poor	-	-	24	1.8

Primary Expectation for Superintendent

Educational leadership is the primary expectation with 66.2% Long Island respondents which is significantly higher compared to 41.5% as reported by AASA 2006 Study.

Table 29

Comparison of Board's Primary Expectation for Superintendent as Perceived by the Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island, in New York and AASA 2006 Study

	Nassau Suffolk Total		AASA 2006 Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Educational leader (e.g., curriculum and instruction, etc.)	45	66.2	550	41.5
Political leader (e.g., board and community relations)	7	10.3	206	15.5
Managerial leader (e.g., general management, budget, and finance)	14	20.6	457	34.5
Other	2	2.9	113	8.5

Perspective of Board Ethics

The studies noted that the superintendents' perspective of board ethics is significantly high, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference between the ratings of *all the time* and *most of the time* combined.

Table 30

Comparison of Superintendents' Perspective of Board Ethics in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and AASA Study 2006

	Nassau Suffolk Total		AASA 2006 Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All of the time	34	50.0	545	41.1
Most of the time	32	47.1	692	52.2
Seldom	2	2.9	70	5.3
Never	-	-	19	1.4

Leaving a District Due to Ethical Problems

Eight and eight tenths percent of superintendents in Long Island indicated leaving superintendency due to ethical problems involving a board is significantly lower, as compared to 16.2% of AASA Study 2006.

Table 31

Comparison of Superintendents' Leaving a District Due to Ethical Problems in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and AASA Study 2006

	Nassau Suffolk Total		AASA 2006 Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
YES	6	8.8	215	16.2
NO	62	91.2	1111	83.8

Research Questions

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire includes 20 questions relating to general job satisfaction. The respondents responded on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from a low of 1 point given for “very dissatisfied,” 2 points for “dissatisfied,” 3 points for “N” (if the respondent could not decide whether satisfied or not with this aspect of the job), 4 points for “satisfied,” and a high of 5 points for “very satisfied.”

Items 1-20 measure general job satisfaction. Items 1,2,3,4,7,8,9,10,11,15,16, and 20 measure the intrinsic job satisfaction. Items 5, 6,12,13,14, and 19 measure the extrinsic job satisfaction. The data was collected from 68 superintendents from Nassau (33) and Suffolk (35) Counties (Long Island) in New York.

Research Question 1: What is the overall level of satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?

Respondents were asked to indicate a level of satisfaction on 20 items relating to general job satisfaction on a five-point Likert scale ranging from a low “Very Dissatisfied” to a high “Very Satisfied.” The minimum average score of a superintendent is 2.80 and the maximum average score is 5.00 on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Survey. The mean level of overall satisfaction of the 68 responding superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, is 4.17 (SD=.41) as given in Table 32. The areas of highest general job satisfaction were the following: item (9) Chance to do things for other people (M=4.74) and item (11) Chance to do something that makes use of my

abilities ($M=4.63$). The areas of least satisfaction expressed by the respondents were as follows: item (5) Way my boss handles his/her workers ($M=3.63$) and item (6) Competence of my supervisor in making decisions ($M=3.59$). Table 33 provides the mean score for each question on the MSQ.

It can be concluded that the overall or general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York is positive and rated more than satisfied.

Table 32

General Job Satisfaction Range of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

Variable	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
General Score	68	2.80	5.00	4.17	.41

Table 33

General Job Satisfaction Mean Scores Reported by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Item	Mean	SD
1.	Being able to keep busy	4.41	0.72
2.	Chance to work alone on the job	3.78	0.75
3.	Chance to do different things from time to time	4.57	0.58
4.	Chance to be "somebody" in the community	4.21	0.74
5.	Way my boss handles his/her workers	3.63	0.91
6.	Competence of my supervisor in making decisions	3.59	0.90
7.	Able to do things that don't go against my conscience	4.46	0.70
8.	Way my job provides for steady employment	4.16	0.92
9.	Chance to do things for other people	4.74	0.48
10.	Chance to tell people what to do	3.88	0.84
11.	Chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	4.63	0.57
12.	Way company policies are put into practice	3.84	0.84
13.	Pay and the amount of work I do	3.87	0.90
14.	Chance for advancement on this job	3.90	0.81
15.	Freedom to use my own judgment	4.54	0.58
16.	Chance to try my own methods of doing job	4.44	0.70
17.	Working conditions	4.31	0.85
18.	Way my co-workers get along with each other	4.12	0.68
19.	Praise for doing a good job	3.71	1.02
20.	Feeling of accomplishment from my job	4.56	0.53

Research Question 2: What is the level of intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) New York?

Respondents were asked to indicate a level of satisfaction on 12 items relating to intrinsic job satisfaction on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from a low "Very Dissatisfied" to a high "Very Satisfied." The minimum average score of a superintendent is 3.08 and the maximum average score is 5.00 on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Survey. The mean level of overall satisfaction of the 68 responding superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction

Questionnaire, is 4.37 (SD=.39) as given in Table 34. The areas of highest intrinsic job satisfaction were the following: item (9) Chance to do things for other people (M=4.74) and item (11) Chance to do something that makes use of my abilities (M=4.63). The areas of least intrinsic satisfaction expressed by the respondents were as follows: item (10) Chance to tell people what to do (M=3.63) and item (2) Chance to work alone on the job (M=3.78). Please see Table 35.

It can be concluded that intrinsic general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), in New York is highly positive and rated fairly higher than satisfied.

Table 34

Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Range of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Intrinsic Score	68	3.08	5.00	4.37	.39

Table 35

Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Mean Scores as Reported by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Item	Mean	SD
1.	Being able to keep busy	4.41	0.72
2.	Chance to work alone on the job	3.78	0.75
3.	Chance to do different things from time to time	4.57	0.58
4.	Chance to be "somebody" in the community	4.21	0.74
7.	Abel to do things that don't go against my conscience	4.46	0.70
8.	Way my job provides for steady employment	4.16	0.92
9.	Chance to do things for other people	4.74	0.48
10.	Chance to tell people what to do	3.88	0.84
11.	Chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	4.63	0.57
15.	Freedom to use my own judgment	4.54	0.58
16.	Chance to try my own methods of doing job	4.44	0.70
20.	Feeling of accomplishment from my job	4.56	0.53

Research Question 3: What is the level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York?

Respondents were asked to indicate a level of satisfaction on 6 items relating to extrinsic job satisfaction on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from a low "Very Dissatisfied" to a high "Very Satisfied." The minimum average score of a superintendent is 2.17 and the maximum average score is 5.00 on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Survey. The mean level of overall satisfaction of the 68 responding superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, is 3.75 (SD=.59) as given in Table 36. The areas of highest extrinsic job satisfaction were the following: item (14) Chance for advancement on this job (M=3.90) and item (13) Pay and the amount of work I do (M=3.87). The areas of least extrinsic satisfaction expressed by the respondents were as follows: item (6) Competence of my

supervisor in making decisions (M=3.59) and item (5) Way my boss handles his/her workers (M=3.63). Please see Table 37 below.

It can be concluded that extrinsic general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York is satisfactory and rated closer to satisfied.

Table 36

Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Range of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), in New York

Variable	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Extrinsic Score	68	2.17	5.00	3.75	.59

Table 37

Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Mean Scores as Reported by Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York

	Item	Mean	SD
5.	Way my boss handles his/her workers	3.63	0.91
6.	Competence of my supervisor in making decisions	3.59	0.90
12.	Way company policies are put into practice	3.84	0.84
13.	Pay and the amount of work I do	3.87	0.90
14.	Chance for advancement on this job	3.90	0.81
19.	Praise for doing a good job	3.71	1.02

Research Question 4: What is the level of relationship between overall job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York and the impact of factors such as age, gender, salary level, years of experience, levels of education, and the school district size?

The correlation coefficients between overall satisfaction and a set of demographic factors (age, gender, salary, education level, size, superintendent years, current position years) ranged from .01 to .24; none are significantly different than 0. The correlations were age: .13; gender: .01; salary: .22; doctoral: -.24; size: .22; years superintendent: .08; years current position: .01. The negative size for “doctorate” simply means that a low score, 1, was associated with a higher educational degree.

However, a multiple regression analysis demonstrated that two predictor variables, size of district and possession of a doctoral degree, together accounted for a significant amount of variance in overall satisfaction, $F(2, 65) = 3.262, p = .045$ (see Table 39). The proportion of overall satisfaction variance explained simultaneously by these two predictor variables (R^2) was 0.092 (Table 38). The Beta coefficients associated with doctoral degree and district size were -.21 and .19, respectively, indicating that they contributed approximately equally to the prediction of overall superintendent satisfaction (see Table 40). Neither of these two predictor variables alone accounted for a significant proportion of variance in general satisfaction.

It can be concluded that the demographic variables such as age, gender, salary, education level, size, superintendent years and current position years alone had no impact on general job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York.

Table 38

Regression Model Summary: Predicting General Satisfaction from District Size and Doctorate

<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> Square	Adjusted <i>R</i> Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.302(a)	.092	.063	.40112

Predictors: (Constant); size, doctorate

Table 39

ANOVA General Job Satisfaction and District Size and Doctorate

Model	Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Regression	1.050	2	.525	3.262	.045(a)
Residual	10.458	65	.161		
Total	11.508	67			

Predictors: (Constant); size, doctorate

Dependent Variable: general job satisfaction

Table 40

Coefficients General Job Satisfaction and District Size and Doctorate

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	<i>B</i>	Std. Error	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
(Constant)	4.209	.207		20.346	.000
DOCTORATE	-.180	.103	-.209	-1.749	.085
SIZE	.070	.044	.190	1.593	.116

Dependent Variable: general job satisfaction

Research Question 5: Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents between Nassau County and Suffolk County (Long Island) in New York?

Table 42

Independent Samples Test of Overall, Intrinsic, and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction Between Nassau and Suffolk Counties

Variable Job			
Satisfaction	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2 tailed)
Overall	-.76	66	.448
Intrinsic	-.98	66	.333
Extrinsic	-.51	66	.612

Research Question 6: Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

One-sample *t*-tests were used to compare the satisfaction measures (overall, intrinsic, and extrinsic) of Long Island superintendents with the mean satisfaction scores from Hunterdon and Somerset Counties, New Jersey. The New Jersey mean satisfaction scores were used as the test values for all of the one-sample *t*-tests: general satisfaction mean: 4.12; intrinsic satisfaction mean: 4.29; and extrinsic satisfaction mean: 3.80.

These analyses revealed no significant differences between these New Jersey test values and the corresponding Long Island satisfaction means. For general satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (4.17) was not significantly different than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 0.93, p = .354$. For intrinsic satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean

(4.37) was not significantly different than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 1.61, p = .113$. For extrinsic satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (3.75) was not significantly different than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 0.63, p = .530$.

It can be concluded that there are no statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey.

Research Question 7: Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey?

One-sample t -tests were used to compare the satisfaction measures (general, intrinsic, and extrinsic) of Long Island superintendents with the mean satisfaction scores from superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey. The affluent New Jersey mean satisfaction scores were used as the test values for all of the one-sample t -tests: general satisfaction mean: 3.93; intrinsic satisfaction mean: 4.04; and extrinsic satisfaction mean: 3.58. These analyses revealed significantly higher satisfaction scores for the Long Island superintendents compared to the test values from affluent New Jersey districts. For general satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (4.17) was significantly higher than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 4.71, p < .001$. For intrinsic satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (4.37) was significantly higher than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 6.95, p < .001$. For extrinsic satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (3.75) was significantly higher than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 2.46, p = .017$.

Research Question 8: What is the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, using the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) State of the Superintendency Survey?

A survey instrument adapted from the AASA (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey* pertaining to board-superintendent relationships was sent to the respondents. The respondents completed ten survey questions that reflect the level of relationship between the board and a superintendent of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

More than a third (39.7%) of superintendents felt their boards lead their districts *well*. Almost another third (32.4%) felt boards lead the district *very well*. Only 3 superintendents (4.4%) out of 68 felt their boards lead the district *poorly or very poorly*. Over 70% of the respondents noted that the average tenure of a board member is six or more years in a district. Seventy and six tenths percent of responding superintendents indicated the most important reason for being hired as the *leadership ability* and 10.3% indicated for *personal characteristics*. Over 50% respondents noted that they spent 5 hours or less in direct communication with board members and about 35% spent between 6-10 hours.

The overwhelming majority (97%) of superintendents ($n=66$) described present relationships with the board in an extremely positive manner, 63.2% indicated as *very good* and 33.8% noted as *good*. 66.2% of the responding superintendents indicated that *educational leadership* activities such as working with curriculum and instruction were the primary expectation for being hired by the board. Ninety seven percent of the

superintendents indicated that the board acted ethically *most of the time or all the time*. Less than 9% of superintendents indicated that they had to leave a district dissatisfied due to an ethical problem with the board. Ninety-seven and one tenth percent of responding superintendents stated that the community support as *very good or good*.

It can be concluded that superintendent-board relationships are extremely positive in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, using the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*. This confirms high job satisfaction expressed by the same superintendents on the MSQ.

Research Question 9: Are there any significant differences in the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) State of the Superintendency Survey) in comparison to The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study by American Association of School Administrators (2007)?

Relevant questions were addressed to verify if there were any significant differences in the superintendent-board relationships between Nassau and Suffolk Counties and the AASA national study.

For the question "From your perspective, how well does the board lead the district?" - data from the 2006 AASA survey were compared to the current sample. A

Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio Test indicated that the distribution of responses, from “Very Poorly” to “Very Well,” differed significantly across the two samples, $\chi^2(3) = 13.36, p = .004$. About 94% of the 2008 survey respondents answered “Well” or “Very Well” compared to only 79% of the AASA 2006 survey respondents. Consistent with this finding, a Mann-Whitney nonparametric test of ordinal ranks indicated that the 2008 survey yielded higher scores compared to the 2006 survey ($U = 25732.500, p = .001$). The results are noted in Tables 43 – 45.

Table 43

Comparison of How Well the Board Leads the District Between Long Island Districts and AASA Study 2006

		Leads the District				
		Very Poorly	Poorly	Well	Very Well	Total
AASA Study 2006	Count	61	220	716	328	1325
	% within year of administration	4.6%	16.6%	54.0%	24.8%	100.0%
Nassau & Suffolk Counties 2008	Count	1	2	27	22	52
	% within year of administration	1.9%	3.8%	51.9%	42.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	62	222	743	350	1377
	% within year of administration	4.5%	16.1%	54.0%	25.4%	100.0%

Table 44

Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio Test for How Well the Board Leads the District

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.957(a)	3	.008
Likelihood Ratio	13.361	3	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.342	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	1377		

(a) 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.34.

Table 46

Relationship with Board: Comparison of Long Island Districts and AASA Survey 2006

		Relationship with Board				
		Very Poor	Poor	Good	Good Very	Total
AASA Survey 2006	Count	24	68	401	833	1326
	% within Survey	1.8%	5.1%	30.2%	62.8%	100.0%
Nassau Suffolk Counties 2008	Count	0	2	23	43	68
	% within Survey					
	Year	.0%	2.9%	33.8%	63.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	24	70	424	876	1394
	% within Survey					
	Year	1.7%	5.0%	30.4%	62.8%	100.0%

Ranks

	Survey Year	<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Relationship with Board	2006	1326	696.85	924017.00
	2008	68	710.26	48298.00
	Total	1394		

Test Statistics

	Relationship with Board
Mann-Whitney <i>U</i>	44216.000
Wilcoxon <i>W</i>	924017.000
<i>Z</i>	-.315
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.753

Grouping Variable: AASA Survey and Nassau & Suffolk Counties

For the question “What is the most important reason the board hired you?” data from the 2006 AASA survey were compared to the current sample. A Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio Test indicated that the distribution of responses - ability to maintain the

status quo, experience as a change agent, financial management skill, leadership ability, management skills, personal characteristics, other - differed significantly across the two samples, $\chi^2 (6) = 37.92, p < .001$. For the Long Island 2008 sample, the response category “leadership ability” yielded a higher percentage compared to 2006 AASA survey (71% versus 50%). On the other hand, the 2006 AASA study yielded proportionally higher responses for the category “management skill” (14% versus 4%) and for “personal characteristics” (22% versus 10%).

For the question “Which of the following is your board’s *primary* expectation of you as a superintendent?” data from the 2006 AASA survey were compared to the current sample. A Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio Test indicated that the distribution of responses - educational leader, political leader, managerial leader, other - differed significantly across the two samples, $\chi^2 (3) = 16.75, p = .001$. The most noteworthy differences between the two survey years was observed for the response category “educational leader” (AASA 2006 survey: 42%, Long Island: 66%) and for “managerial leader” (AASA 2006 survey: 35%; Long Island: 21%).

For the question “Does your board act ethically?” data from the 2006 AASA survey were compared to the current sample. A Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio Test indicated that the distribution of responses - all of the time, most of the time, seldom, or never - did not differ significantly across the two samples, $\chi^2 (3) = 4.08, p = .253$. About 97% of the Long Island 2008 survey respondents answered “all of the time” or “most of the time” compared to 93% of the AASA 2006 survey respondents. Consistent with this finding, a

Mann-Whitney nonparametric test of ordinal ranks indicated that the 2008 survey yielded similar score ranks compared to the 2006 AASA survey ($U = 40372, p = .10$).

For the question “In your career as a superintendent, have you had an ethical problem with a board to the point that it forced you to leave a district?” data from the 2006 AASA survey were compared to the current sample. A Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio Test indicated that the distribution of responses - no or yes - did not differ significantly across the two samples, $\chi^2(1) = 3.15, p = .08$. About 91% of the Long Island 2008 survey respondents answered “no” compared to 84% of the 2006 AASA survey respondents.

In summary, in primary areas such as relationships with the board, board acting ethically, leaving the district due to ethical reasons with the board, the superintendents’ responses in Nassau and Suffolk (Long Island), New York, did not differ significantly with the AASA 2006 study. The superintendents in Long Island districts rated their boards leading their districts very high compared to AASA 2006 study. Both studies show that the superintendents are highly satisfied with their relationships with the board. The reasons for hiring and the primary expectation for being hired differed significantly between the two studies.

Supplemental Research

The researcher further tried to ascertain the correlation between the MSQ and the AASA survey questions, particularly in relation to job satisfaction.

The big picture is that MSQ questions 5 (the way my board handles the employees) and 19 (praise for doing a good job) appear to be good predictors of AASA questions 1 (how well the board leads the district) and 5 (present relationship with the board).

AASA questions 1 and 5 were correlated with *all* of the individual items on the MSQ. Many of the MSQ items correlated significantly with these two AASA questions, but in particular MSQ questions 5 and 19 correlated the highest: Correlation of AASA question 1 and MSQ question 5 = .52; Correlation of AASA question 1 and MSQ question 19 = .48; Correlation of AASA question 5 and MSQ question 5 = .54; Correlation of AASA question 5 and MSQ question 19 = .59.

MSQ 6 also correlates, but not as highly: Correlation of AASA question 1 and MSQ question 6 = .36; Correlation of AASA question 5 and MSQ question 6 = .48.

A multiple regression was computed, using AASA 1 as the criterion, and MSQ questions 5, 6, and 19 as the predictors. The multiple correlation coefficient (R) was .58; these three predictors accounted for a significant proportion of variance in AASA 1, $F(3, 64) = 10.698, p < .001$. If MSQ question 6 (as it does not really contribute to the prediction) was dropped, R equals .58, and these two predictors account for a significant proportion of variance in AASA 1, $F(2, 65) = 16.290, p < .001$.

Further, a correlation of "overall satisfaction" with AASA 1 (how well does the board lead the district) and with AASA question 5 (present relationship with the board) was performed: r (overall satisfaction, AASA 1) = .46 ($p < .01$); r (overall satisfaction, AASA 5) = .56 ($p < .01$).

A regression of overall satisfaction (the criterion) on AASA question 1 and AASA question 5, and only AASA question 5 was retained in the model – AASA question 5 is a

better predictor of satisfaction, and adding AASA question 1 does not improve the prediction (because AASA question 1 and AASA question 5 are correlated, so when AASA question 1 is added, it does not explain any additional variance above what AASA question 5 has already explained). Therefore, the best predictor of satisfaction is "present relationship with the board."

Since all but 2 of the respondents chose 3 (good) or 4 (very good) on AASA question 5, a *t*-test was performed comparing the "good" relationship group with the "very good" relationship group: "Good" on AASA question 5: mean overall satisfaction = 3.87; "Very Good" on AASA question 5: mean overall satisfaction = 4.35.

This is a significant difference, $t(64) = 5.291$, $p < .001$. So, superintendents having a "very good relationship with the board" are associated with significantly higher satisfaction compared to superintendents who report a "good relationship with the board."

As a supplemental analysis of the relation between the MSQ and the AASA survey, the researcher correlated the overall satisfaction score with items how well does the board lead? (1, lead), approximate length of time a board member serves (2, board years), hours per week in direct communication with board members (4, hours communicating), present relationship with the board (5, relationship), does board act ethically? (8, ethical), superintendent leaving due to an ethical problem with the board (9, forced to leave), and community support for the school district (10, community support). Because each of these AASA items can be put on a continuum from low to high (or yes/no), a correlation coefficient is a quick way to assess a relation between these items and the overall MSQ score. The following AASA items showed a significant correlation with the overall satisfaction measure: how well the board leads the district ($r = .46$, $p < .001$); present

relationship with the board ($r = .56, p < .001$); does board act ethically ($r = -.390, p = .001$). The last correlation is negative because on Question 8 of the Board-Superintendent Relationships Survey (does the board act ethically?), 1 = “all of the time” and 4 equals “never.” The negative correlation indicates that less unethical behavior is associated with higher satisfaction.

Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The news media has focused on reports of massive turnover in the job of superintendency and superintendent firings and continues to write about conflicts between superintendents and their school boards. Search consultants and school districts are finding an inadequate pool of candidates for superintendent jobs.

The public school superintendency in New York, as in other states, has become a difficult position with many challenges such as high stakes testing, inadequate financial resources, stress, accountability, long hours, conflict with school boards, unfunded mandates, and pressure from special interest groups. These factors have made the position less attractive, resulting in perceived low job satisfaction or high job dissatisfaction.

The purpose of this study was to determine the overall job satisfaction, the level of intrinsic job satisfaction, and the level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York. The study also investigated the school board relationships of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York. The study also determined the level of relationship between overall job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and the impact of selected factors of age, gender, salary level, years of experience levels of education and district size. The study examined the following: (a) Whether there were statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents *between* Nassau County and Suffolk County (Long Island) in New York, (b) Whether there were

statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey, and (c) Whether there were statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey. The study also examined the level of relationship between the board and a superintendent of public school in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and determined if there were any significant differences in the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*) in comparison to *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study* by American Association of School Administrators (2007).

Chapter I presented the problem that was studied: What was the perception of job satisfaction and school board relationships of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York? Chapter II provided a review of literature on the job satisfaction and school board relationships of public school superintendents across the nation. Chapter III included the description of the methodology used in this study to evaluate the data provided by the respondents. Chapter IV provided an analysis of data collected. Chapter V included a summary, conclusions, and recommendations for policy, practice, and future research.

The following research questions were asked in this study:

1. What is the overall level of satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?
2. What is the level of intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York?
3. What is the level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York?
4. What is the level of relationship between overall job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and the impact of factors such as: age, gender, salary level, years of experience, levels of education, and the school district size?
5. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents between Nassau County and Suffolk County (Long Island) in New York?
6. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?
7. Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey?

8. What is the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, using the American Association of School Administrators' *2006 State of the Superintendency Survey*?

9. Are there any significant differences in the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*) in comparison to *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study by American Association of School Administrators (2007)*?

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form, Weiss et al., 1977) was chosen to measure superintendents' general satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, and extrinsic satisfaction. The MSQ has been used far more frequently than any other instruments mentioned above in the last 30 years (Malanowski, 1999). It was used in the study of job satisfaction among superintendents in New Jersey by Richard O' Malley (2004) and also by Gene M. Solomon (2004). Approval to use the revised version (1977) of the MSQ was obtained from the University of Minnesota, Department of Psychology, Vocational Psychology Research.

The MSQ is a paper and pencil inventory of the extent to which both vocational needs and values are satisfied on the job. The MSQ is gender neutral, can be administered to groups or to individuals, and is appropriate for use with individuals who can read at the fifth grade level or higher. Instructions for the administration of the MSQ are given in the

questionnaire booklet. The 20 responses on the MSQ are scored using a 5-point Likert scale: very satisfied (5-VS), satisfied (4-S), neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3-N), dissatisfied (2-DS), and very dissatisfied (1-VDS). The MSQ Short Form takes 10 minutes to complete. The 20 items, which are used to measure intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and general job satisfaction, are as follows:

General Satisfaction

Supervision-human relations: The way my boss handles his/her employees.

Supervision-technical: The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.

The addition of *all* items from the intrinsic and extrinsic scales listed below.

Intrinsic Job Satisfaction

Ability utilization: The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.

Achievement: The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

Activity: Being able to keep busy all the time.

Advancement: The chances for advancement on this job.

Compensation: My pay and the amount of work I do.

Co-workers: The way my co-workers get along with each other.

Creativity: The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.

Independence: The chance to work alone on the job.

Moral values: Being able to do things that do not go against my conscience.

Social service: The chance to do things for other people.

Social status: The chance to be “somebody” in the community.

Working conditions: The working conditions.

Variety: The chance to do different things from time to time

Extrinsic Satisfaction

Authority: The chance to tell other people what to do.

Company policies and practices: The way company policy and practices are put into practice.

Recognition: The praise I get for doing a good job.

Responsibility: The freedom to use my own judgment.

Security: The way my job provides for steady employment.

Variety: The chance to do different things from time to time.

The MSQ short form provides three sub-scores: (a) general job satisfaction (b) extrinsic job satisfaction, and (c) intrinsic job satisfaction. The general satisfaction sub-score is a measure of the work and the environment based on the intrinsic items, extrinsic

items, and two general items (Weiss, et al., 1977). The intrinsic sub-score is a measure of job satisfaction with the work itself. The extrinsic sub-score is a measure of job satisfaction with the work environ The MSQ consists of four pages. Page four consists of questions relating to general demographic characteristics of respondents. This page was replaced with a data form that was more appropriate for this study.

The researcher also chose a second instrument to ascertain the relationship of a school board and a superintendent. The instrument is the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) sponsored 10-year studies have proven to be seminal works in literature, discussing the American school superintendent. For over 80 years, these studies have provided an extensive database describing superintendent demographics, board relations, professional development, districts, and career paths (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). These studies have become a primary national source document about superintendents and extensively used by researchers, national and state policymakers and others interested in the nation's school leadership. The studies were conducted approximately every 10 years since 1923.

The American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey* has targeted a set of key content areas important to the superintendency including board-superintendent relationships. The researcher used the survey questions pertaining to superintendent and school board relations.

Summary of Research

Demographic Data

Age

Ninety-one percent of superintendents ($n=68$) in Nassau and Suffolk Counties were 50 years or older. Less than 9% of the superintendents were below 50 years of age. It was noted that 47.1% ($n=32$) of the respondents were between the ages 55-59, and 29.4% ($n=20$) were between the ages 60-64. Only 4.4% ($n=3$) of the superintendents responded were between the ages 35-44.

Gender

Seventy-two percent of the superintendents ($n=49$) who responded were men as compared to 28% ($n=19$) women superintendents.

Salary

Seventy-four percent of the superintendents ($n=50$) salary was between \$175,001 to \$250,000. 2.9% ($n=2$) superintendents made a salary of less than \$150,000 and 5.9% ($n=4$) made a salary between the range \$275,001-\$300,000, which was the highest range as noted in both the Counties.

Education

Almost two-thirds 65% ($n=44$) of the responding superintendents possessed a doctoral degree.

District size

Sixty-one percent of the responding superintendents ($n=39$) worked in districts between 1000- 4999 students. Thirty two and four tenths percent of the superintendents ($n=22$) responded worked in districts with pupils 5000 or over.

Structure of the district

Seventy-eight percent of the districts ($n=53$) are K-12 configured districts and 13.2% districts ($n=9$) are K-6 school districts.

Type of the district

Ninety percent of the responding superintendents worked in suburban districts. Eight and eight tenths percent of respondents ($n=6$) worked in rural districts located only in Suffolk County.

Years as a superintendent

Over one-third of superintendents ($n=26$) are new superintendents with less than three years experience as a superintendent, and almost two-thirds of superintendents ($n=42$) have 4 or more years of experience as a superintendent. The average number of years of experience of the responding superintendents is 7.5 years.

Years as a superintendent in the current district/position

Fifty percent of the superintendents ($n=34$) are in the current position for less than 3 years. Twenty seven and nine tenths percent of the responding superintendents ($n=19$)

have been in the current position for more than 7 years. The average number of years of the responding superintendents in the current position/district is 4.8 years.

The demographic data suggest that a superintendent in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York is typically a male in his fifties with a doctorate degree, working in a suburban K-12 school district for over 7 years with over 3000 students and making a salary between \$175,001- \$250,000.

There was no indication that the factors such as age, gender, salary, education level, district size, structure, type, and experience had any impact on the overall job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York. The study is consistent with Adcock (1991) study in Arkansas that concluded that variables of education, longevity in the position, size of district, number of superintendencies held, and type of district did not have significant variance on choice of job satisfiers among superintendents.

Board-Superintendent Relationships Survey Data

More than a third (39.7%) of superintendents felt their board leads the district *well*. Almost another third (32.4%) felt the board leads the district *very well*. Only three superintendents (4.4%) out of 68 felt their board leads the district *poorly or very poorly*. Over 70% of the respondents noted that the average tenure of a board member is six or more years in a district. Seventy and sixth tenths percent of responding superintendents indicated the most important reason for being hired as the *leadership ability* and 10.3% indicated for *personal characteristics*. Over 50% respondents noted that they spent 5

hours or less in direct communication with board members and about 35% spent between 6-10 hours.

An overwhelming majority (97%) of superintendents ($n=66$) described the present relationships with the board in an extremely positive manner, 63.2% indicated as *very good* and 33.8% noted as *good*. Sixty six and two tenths percent of the responding superintendents indicated that *educational leadership* activities, such as working with curriculum and instruction were the primary expectation for being hired by the board. Ninety seven percent of the superintendents indicated that the board acted ethically *most of the time* or *all the time*. Less than 9% of superintendents indicated that they had to leave a district dissatisfied due to an ethical problem with the board. Ninety seven and one tenths percent of responding superintendents stated that community support was *very good* or *good*.

It can be concluded that superintendent-board relationships are extremely positive in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, using the American Association of School Administrators' 2006 *State of the Superintendency Survey*. This confirmed high job satisfaction expressed by the same superintendents on the MSQ. This confirmed the AASA 2006 study that states that the superintendents are not only generally pleased with their board's performance but they also say their districts enjoy sizeable amounts of community support.

Job Satisfaction and Board-Superintendent Relationships Conclusions

Research Question 1

What is the overall level of satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire?

The superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York were more than satisfied with the overall level of job satisfaction as reflected on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire survey. The mean level of overall satisfaction of the 68 public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, is 4.17 ($SD = .41$) as provided in Table 26. Based on a 5-point Likert scale, the mean score of 4.17 falls between the satisfied and very satisfied levels.

The work of Borquist (1987), Lindstorm (1988), Nelson (1987), and Whitsell (1987) indicated that the superintendents derive satisfaction from autonomy, achievement, and service to others. The findings of this study were consistent with these observations. The survey questions, “the chance to try my own methods of doing the job,” “the chance to do things for other people,” “the freedom to use my own judgment,” and “the feeling of accomplishment that I get from the job,” scored high with a mean score of 4.44, 4.74, 4.54, and 4.56 respectively based on a 5-point Likert scale (see Table 33).

The literature indicated a high degree of frustration in the job among superintendents across the nation and most commentators portray the superintendency as

a thankless and sometimes impossible job. Glass (2000) and colleagues found that only 6 percent of their sample said they derived little or no satisfaction from their jobs. Contrary to the survey, the findings of this study indicated a positive job satisfaction among superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

Research Question 2

What is the level of intrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York?

The superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York were highly satisfied with the intrinsic level of job satisfaction as reflected on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire survey. The mean level of intrinsic job satisfaction of the 68 responding superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, is 4.37 (SD=.39) as given in Table 29. This indicated the intrinsic job satisfaction was very high among the superintendents. Based on a 5-point Likert scale, the mean score of 4.37 falls between the satisfied and very satisfied levels. The intrinsic job satisfaction mean score of 4.37 (based on a 5-point Likert scale) was higher than the overall job satisfaction mean score of 4.17, indicating that the intrinsic factors was a major factor significantly contributing to the overall job satisfaction of the superintendents.

Spector (1997) stated that behavior by an employee was intended to help coworkers or the organization. This study supports this view as questions such as “the chance to do things for other people” (mean score of 4.74), and “the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job” (mean score of 4.56), were rated very high showing a high level of intrinsic job satisfaction.

This study was consistent with Malanowski (1999) study of urban superintendents in New Jersey, where he found that all intrinsic factors such as social service, ability utilization, variety, responsibility, creativity, achievement, and social status. Whitsell (1987) study among Texas superintendents found that satisfaction was derived from ability to do things for others, to do things that did not go against personal values, and the feeling of accomplishment.

Research Question 3

What is the level of extrinsic job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York?

The superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York were satisfied with the extrinsic level of job satisfaction as reflected on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire survey. The mean level of extrinsic job satisfaction of the 68 responding superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, is 3.75 ($SD=.59$) as given in Table 36. Although the extrinsic level of job satisfaction was close to “satisfied,” yet the mean level of extrinsic job satisfaction (3.75) was significantly lower than the mean level of intrinsic level of job satisfaction (4.37).

Whitsell (1987) study of job satisfaction of Texas superintendents observed that the least satisfying factors were the possibility of advancement, the amount of praise received, salary, and skill of the board. Nelson (1987) study of Nebraska superintendents also found the least satisfaction in the areas of opportunity for advancement, the ability of

their board to make good decisions, and the lack of recognition they received from their board for a job well done.

Research Question 4

What is the level of relationship between overall job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and the impact of factors such as age, gender, salary level, years of experience, levels of education, and the school district size?

The correlation coefficients between overall satisfaction and a set of demographic factors (age, gender, salary, education level, size, superintendent years, current position years) ranged from .01 to .24; none are significantly different than 0. There was no one factor alone contributing to a significant proportion of variance in general satisfaction. However, a multiple regression analysis demonstrated that 2 predictor variables, size of district and possession of a doctoral degree, together accounted for a significant amount of variance in overall satisfaction, $F(2, 65) = 3.262, p = .045$. The proportion of overall satisfaction variance explained simultaneously by these two predictor variables (R^2) was 0.092. The Beta coefficients associated with doctoral degree and district size were -.21 and .19, respectively, indicating that they contributed approximately equally to the prediction of overall superintendent satisfaction. The overall job satisfaction of superintendents with a doctorate and working in a larger sized district combined, contributed to slightly higher level of job satisfaction. Neither of these two predictor variables alone accounted for a significant proportion of variance in general satisfaction.

Chand's (1982) study of Alaska's 52 school superintendents revealed that there was no significant relationship found between demographic characteristics and job satisfaction. Nelson (1987) study of Nebraska school superintendents noted a statistical difference between salary and the general job satisfaction score on the MSQ, however, no practical significance was derived. Adcock's (1991) study of Arkansas superintendents concluded that variables of education, longevity in position, size of the district, and type of the district did not have any significant variance on overall job satisfaction. This researcher's study is consistent with these conclusions.

Research Question 5

Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents *between* Nassau County and Suffolk County (Long Island) in New York?

There were no significant differences in the satisfaction factors *between* Nassau and Suffolk Counties public school superintendents. This was concluded from the tests performed.

Independent *t*-tests revealed no significant differences between Nassau County and Suffolk County superintendents on any of the three measures of satisfaction (overall, intrinsic, and extrinsic). For overall satisfaction, the Nassau County sample mean (4.13) was not significantly different from the Suffolk County mean (4.20), $t(66) = -0.76$, $p = .448$. For intrinsic satisfaction, the Nassau County sample mean (4.32) was not significantly different than the Suffolk County mean (4.41), $t(66) = -0.98$, $p = .333$. For extrinsic satisfaction, the Nassau County sample mean (3.72) was not significantly different from the Suffolk County mean (3.79), $t(66) = -0.51$, $p = .612$.

Research Question 6

Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in Hunterdon and Somerset Counties in New Jersey?

It was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in the satisfaction factors of Long Island Nassau and Suffolk school districts and New Jersey Hunterdon and Somerset school districts.

One-sample *t*-tests were used to compare the satisfaction measures (overall, intrinsic, and extrinsic) of Long Island superintendents with the mean satisfaction scores from Hunterdon and Somerset Counties, New Jersey. The New Jersey mean satisfaction scores were used as the test values for all of the one-sample *t*-tests: Overall satisfaction mean: 4.12; intrinsic satisfaction mean: 4.29; and extrinsic satisfaction mean: 3.80.

These analyses revealed no significant differences between these New Jersey test values and the corresponding Long Island satisfaction means. For overall satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (4.17) was not significantly different than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 0.93, p = .354$. For intrinsic satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (4.37) was not significantly different than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 1.61, p = .113$. For extrinsic satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (3.75) was not significantly different than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 0.63, p = .530$.

Research Question 7

Are there statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York and public school superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey?

One-sample *t*-tests were used to compare the satisfaction measures (overall, intrinsic, and extrinsic) of Long Island superintendents with the mean satisfaction scores from superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) districts in New Jersey. The affluent New Jersey mean satisfaction scores were used as the test values for all of the one-sample *t*-tests: Overall satisfaction mean: 3.93; intrinsic satisfaction mean: 4.04; and extrinsic satisfaction mean: 3.58. These analyses revealed significantly higher satisfaction scores for the Long Island superintendents compared to the test values from affluent New Jersey districts. For overall satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (4.17) was significantly higher than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 4.71, p < .001$. For intrinsic satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (4.37) was significantly higher than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 6.95, p < .001$. For extrinsic satisfaction, the Long Island sample mean (3.75) was significantly higher than the New Jersey test value, $t(67) = 2.46, p = .017$.

Research Question 8

What is the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, using the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*?

The working relationship between boards and their superintendents sets a tone for the organizational climate of a school district. Literature often creates an impression that superintendents are sole captains of their ships. But they are not, as they share the wheel with their employer, the school board. A survey instrument adapted from the AASA (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey* pertaining to board-superintendent relationships was sent to the respondents. The respondents completed ten survey questions that reflect the level of relationship between the board and a superintendent of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

Working relationships with boards were seen by Long Island superintendents to be *very good* or *good* 97% of the time, which is an overwhelming majority. The superintendents were also highly satisfied with their board leadership as only 3 superintendents (4.4%, n=68) felt their boards were leading *poorly* or *very poorly*.

Ninety seven percent of the superintendents indicated that the board acted ethically *most of the time* or *all the time*. Less than 9% of superintendents indicated that they had to leave a district dissatisfied due to an ethical problem with the board. Over 50% respondents noted that they spent 5 hours or less in direct communication with board members and about 35% spent between 6-10 hours, suggesting good communication lines.

Long Island superintendents were pleased with how well the boards work with them. This was also in conformity with the MSQ overall job satisfaction measurement. Over 97% of superintendents stated community support to be *very good* or *good* which was also reflective of positive relationships between superintendents and school boards.

Research Question 9

Are there any significant differences in the level of relationship between the school board and the public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York (as measured by the American Association of School Administrators' (2006) *State of the Superintendency Survey*) in comparison to *The State of the American School Superintendency, A Mid-Decade Study by American Association of School Administrators* (2007)?

Critical questions were addressed to verify if there were any significant differences in the superintendent-board relationships between Nassau and Suffolk Counties and the 2006 AASA study.

For the question 1, "From your perspective, how well does the board lead the district?" data from the 2006 AASA survey were compared to the current sample. A Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio Test indicated that the distribution of responses, from "Very Poorly" to "Very Well," differed significantly across the two samples, $\chi^2(3) = 13.36, p = .004$. About 94% of public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk answered "well" or "very well" compared to only 79% of the 2006 AASA survey respondents. Consistent with this finding, a Mann-Whitney nonparametric test of ordinal ranks indicated that the researcher's 2008 survey yielded higher scores compared to the 2006 AASA survey ($U = 25732.500, p = .001$).

For the question 5, "How do you characterize your present relationship with the board?" data from the 2006 AASA survey were compared to the current sample. A Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio Test indicated that the distribution of responses, from "Very

Poorly” to “Very Well,” did not show a significant difference across the two samples, $\chi^2(3) = 3.385, p = .336$. For example, the percentage of survey respondents who answered “good” or “very good” was 93% in 2006, compared to 97% for the 2008 sample.

Consistent with this finding, a Mann-Whitney nonparametric test of ordinal ranks indicated that there is no statistical difference between the scores for the two survey administration years ($U = 44216, p = .753$).

The average tenure of a board member was a little over 6 years, both under the current sample and AASA 2006 Survey. The most important reason for being hired as a superintendent differed significantly: leadership ability (Nassau & Suffolk Counties, 70.6% as compared to AASA Study, 49.2%) and personal characteristics (Nassau & Suffolk Counties, 10.3% as compared to AASA Study, 21.7%). There was no significant difference in the data relating to board acting ethically as over 90% of in both samples responded that the board acts ethically *all the time* or *most of the time*.

In summary, in primary areas such as relationships with the board, the board acting ethically, leaving the district due to ethical reasons with the board, the superintendents’ responses in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York, did not differ significantly with the AASA 2006 study. The superintendents in Long Island districts rated their boards leading their districts very high compared to AASA 2006 study. Both studies show that the superintendents are highly satisfied with their relationships with the board.

Additional research was done to ascertain the relationship between the MSQ and the AASA survey. As a supplemental analysis of the relation between the MSQ and the AASA survey, the researcher correlated the overall satisfaction score with items

regarding how well the board leads (1, lead), approximate length of time a board member serves (2, board years), hours per week in direct communication with board members (4, hours communicating), present relationship with the board (5, relationship), ethical behavior of the board (8, ethical), superintendent leaving due to an ethical problem with the board (9, forced to leave), and community support for the school district (10, community support). As each of these AASA items can be put on a continuum from low to high (or yes/no), a correlation coefficient is a quick way to assess a relationship between these items and the overall MSQ score. The following AASA items showed a significant correlation with the overall satisfaction measure: how well the board leads the district ($r = .46, p < .001$); present relationship with the board ($r = .56, p < .001$); ethical behavior of the board ($r = -.390, p = .001$). The last correlation was negative because on question 8 of the board-superintendent relationships survey (does the board act ethically?), 1 = “all of the time” and 4 equals “never.” The negative correlation indicates that less unethical behavior is associated with higher satisfaction. The Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), in New York, superintendents were highly satisfied with their relationships with the board, board leadership and ethics.

Discussion

New York superintendents face tremendous challenges, both educational and financial, yet they derive a high level of job satisfaction from their job and also highly satisfied with the relationships with their school board. Superintendents feel a high level of job satisfaction, as the study indicated that the most important satisfiers were the chance to do things for other people, the chance to do something that makes use of their abilities, and the chance to do different things from time to time. Although the

superintendents were highly satisfied with overall, intrinsic, and extrinsic job satisfaction, the extrinsic job satisfaction factors such as the way the board handles its employees, competence of the board in making decisions, and the praise for doing a good job received low scores. This indicated that more work needs to be done by the superintendents and the school board members to improve these aspects. The study suggests that intrinsic job satisfaction factors override the extrinsic job satisfaction to a certain extent, in contributing to the overall job satisfaction. Any improvement of extrinsic factors is not necessarily financially driven and can be achieved through professional development and building positive relationships.

The study indicated that the demographic variables such as age, gender, salary level, years of experience, levels of education, and the school district size did not have any significant impact by itself on the job satisfaction of the superintendents. This suggests that these variables are not contributing sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction in Long Island superintendents. The overall job satisfaction of superintendents with a doctorate and working in a larger size district combined contributed to slightly higher level of job satisfaction. However, neither of these two factors alone accounted for a significant proportion of variance in general satisfaction.

There were no significant differences in the satisfaction factors between Nassau and Suffolk Counties public school superintendents. There were no statistically significant differences in the satisfaction factors of Nassau and Suffolk superintendents in New York and Hunterdon and Somerset superintendents in New Jersey. The study revealed significantly higher satisfaction scores for the Long Island superintendents compared affluent (DFG I&J) New Jersey districts.

The study concluded that Long Island superintendents maintain very positive working relationships with boards, are highly satisfied with their leadership and ethical conduct and are enjoy overwhelming community support. The data showed that the Long Island superintendents expressed significantly higher level of positive relationships with their school boards than the national survey of AASA 2006 Study. Additional correlation of AASA Survey questions and the MSQ questions further confirmed that there was a high degree of correlation between job satisfaction and superintendent-board relationships, which were very positive among Long Island superintendents and their boards. This suggests that Long Island school districts were modeling many best practices and continuing to build on their strengths and work on their weaknesses.

Recommendations for Practice

1. The results of this study can be helpful for school boards to understand the superintendents' job related "satisfiers" and "dissatisfiers" to forge a better working relationship.
2. The study should be helpful for aspiring superintendents as they can be encouraged by this study as majority of superintendents are highly satisfied with the job and relationship with the board.
3. The study can be used by boards of education and search firms in the hiring process of superintendents and can be helpful for new school board members.
4. The study should be helpful for the school boards association and the superintendents association to provide appropriate professional development to their leaders, particularly in the areas of competency in decision making, effective board-

superintendent roles and relationships, best instructional/leadership practices, and maintaining a positive climate.

5. The state education department and the universities can use the study to design/modify educational leadership programs/courses to provide the candidates a great sense of awareness in the areas of job satisfaction and school-board relationships.

Recommendations for Policy

The amount of training school board members and the superintendents receive has an impact on their actions back at their local level. Studies revealed that school board members perceived the mandatory school board training as useful and as having an impact on school board members' actions back at their local boards of education. In recent years, the New York State Legislature made sweeping reform to restore the public's trust and to monitor local school finances. As a result, a 6 hour fiscal training was legally mandated by the state to school board members. There should consideration for mandatory training in the area of superintendent-school board relationships for organizational effectiveness. Mandatory training should be considered as a requirement for aspiring superintendents and school board members. Continuing education should be mandated to school board members, superintendents and other administrators in the areas such as roles and responsibilities, policy and standards, school law, finance, communications and relationships, conduct at meetings, key educational issues, best practices, and preventing problems and confronting challenges.

The area of tenure for superintendents may be considered. The lack of a large pool of candidates for a superintendent position continues to be a challenge. Job security may allow superintendents to function without the fear of retaliation. Some studies in other

states suggest that tenured superintendents have a significantly higher level of job satisfaction than non-tenured superintendents. The New York State Legislature may consider tenure for superintendents as a tool to attract candidates for the position and to allow stability in school districts.

The state and federal government policies of unfunded mandates seriously impact the superintendents and school boards. The fiscal implications directly affect the perceived success of the superintendent and the school board. The *Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)* - which was enacted on March 15, 1995 and took effect in 1996, following intense pressure from the National Governors Association and others - sets up procedural mechanisms that aim to prevent Congress from imposing costs on states without providing federal funds. *The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act*, required that the federal government consider the financial impact on state and local governments or the private sector of any "enforceable duty" that accompanied federal laws. Although the *Individuals with Disabilities Act* and the *No Child Left Behind Act* are federal laws, the states, counties, cities and local taxpayers have wound up paying for. Unquestionably, further reform and relief are necessary.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. A study of job satisfaction of public school superintendents as compared to the job satisfaction of deputy, associate, and assistant superintendents.
2. A study of job satisfaction of public school superintendents as compared to the Chief Executive Officers of private corporations.
3. The effects of *No Child Left Behind* on the schools and its impact on the effectiveness of superintendency.

4. A study of job satisfaction of superintendents from a pedagogical background v. non-pedagogical (business/management/military) background.

5. A study of overall job satisfaction of school board members serving as a governing member of the board.

6. A study of job satisfaction of minority women superintendents who form minority superintendents (6.1 %) in the nation.

7. A study of job satisfaction of public school superintendents in Long Island in taking a qualitative approach or using an instrument other than the MSQ.

8. Given the job pressures and high levels of stress, a study of the long term effect on health and job satisfaction of superintendents.

9. A qualitative study of board-superintendent relationships and its impact on organizational effectiveness.

Conclusion

Houston (2001) stated that there are few roles as complex or as pivotal as that of a public school superintendent. The public school superintendency in New York, as in other states, has become a difficult position with many challenges such as high stakes testing, inadequate financial resources, stress, accountability, long hours, unfunded mandates, and pressure from special interest groups. Despite these daunting challenges, the superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island) in New York were greatly satisfied with overall job satisfaction. There was also an extremely high level of satisfaction expressed with the aspect of relationships with the school board by a majority of school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. According to AASA 2006

study states that superintendents were very satisfied with their choice of profession and would do it over again if given the choice.

In the last two decades, claims of an acute shortage of public school superintendents and job dissatisfaction due to increasing level of instability have been widely accepted. Some studies and the media accounts appear to be based largely on opinions and not on empirical data. Contrary to the media hype and perceived job dissatisfaction, it is noteworthy, that this study clearly reveals that the superintendents in Long Island are highly satisfied with their jobs and school board relationships. They continue to remain in their position providing stability. Although some frustration is experienced in any top-level position, levels of job dissatisfaction for public school superintendents appear to be have grossly exaggerated and unwarranted.

Too many insignificant demands from various stakeholders, increased federal and state-mandated reforms, lack of resources, political and social constraints will continue to challenge superintendent effectiveness. The current financial crisis that is seriously affecting the nation's economy and global slowdown will have a major impact on state revenues adversely affecting the education funding in New York and other states. Also, New York is faced with a tremendous political push on imposing school property tax caps, limiting the spending. This concept could result in some efficiency in the beginning, but soon will be followed by reduction of programs/services, if there is no additional state aid. Can our students and nation stay globally competitive? We live in extraordinary times and we need outstanding leadership in public education. Boards should review school-system governance, consider redefining and reconstituting the superintendency,

inspect accountability issues, address preparation program deficiencies, and identify talented leaders earlier by building leadership capacity within a school system. We must continue to create a climate that will continue to bring out exceptional educational leaders.

References

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 62, 335-343.

Adcock, P.E. (1991). A comprehensive study concerning the job satisfaction of Arkansas school superintendent. Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 223 1A. (University Microfilm No. 91-34739).

Alderfer, C.P. (1972). Existence, relatedness, and growth: Human needs in organizational settings. New York: Free Press.

Arvey, R.D., Bouchard, T.J., Segal, N.L., & Abraham, L.M. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 187-192.

Begley, T., & Czajka, J. (1993). Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on satisfaction, intent to quit and health following organizational change. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 552-556.

Berry, L. M. (1997). Psychology at work. San Francisco: McGraw Hill Companies Inc.

Blackman, M. C., & Fenwick, L.T. (2000, March 29). Looking for leaders in a time of change. Education Week, pp. 68-69.

Borquist, L. (1987). Job satisfaction of administrators in a public suburban school district. (Doctoral dissertation, Portland State University and the University of Oregon, 1987). Dissertation Abstract International, 48, 2.

- Brief, A.P. (1998). Attitudes in and around organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications
- Brown, S. E. (1978). Superintendent job satisfaction. Southern Journal of Educational Research, 12, 67-74.
- Bruce, W.M., & Blackburn, J.W. (1992). Balancing job satisfaction and performance: A guide for human resource professionals. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Bull, I.H.F. (2005). The Relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment amongst high school teachers in disadvantaged areas in the Western Cape. Mini Thesis, University of Western Cape.
- Byrd, J., Drews, C., & Johnson, J. (2006). Factors impacting superintendent turnover: Lessons from the field. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED493287).
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Carrell, M.R., & Dittrich, J.E. (1978). Equity Theory: The Recent Literature, Methodological Considerations, and New Directions. The Academy of Management Review, 3(2), 202-210.

Carsten, J.M., & Spector, P. E. (1987). Unemployment, job satisfaction, and employee turnover: A meta-analytic test of the Muchinsky model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 374-381.

Chand, K. (1982). Job Satisfaction of Alaska School Superintendents and Its Comparison with the Nationwide American Superintendency. Report of a Study. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226483).

Chandler, B.J., & Childress, J. (1957). Handbook for Illinois school administrators. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.

Champoux, J. E. (2006). Organizational Behavior: Integrating Individuals, Groups and Organizations (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

Cochran, R. F. (1976). Job satisfaction of school superintendents in California. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Pacific, Stockton, CA.

Colorado Association of School Executives (CASE). (2003). The view from the inside: A candid look at today's school superintendent. Englewood, CO. Retrieved June 29, 2005, from www.co-case.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=&subarticlenbr=191%20.

Cooper, B., & Carella, A. V. (2000). Career crisis in the superintendency: The results of a national survey. Portland, OR: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Cooper, B., Fusarelli, L., & Carella, V. (2000). Career crisis in the superintendency? Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 2000. ED443 167.

Costello, R., Greco, J., & McGowan, T. (1992). Clear signals: Reviewing working relationships keeps board and superintendent on course. The American School Board Journal, 179(2), 32-34.

Cliff's Notes.com. Motivation Theories: Individual Needs. 12 Nov 2007
<<http://www.cliffsnotes.com/WileyCDA/CliffsReviewTopic/topicArticleId-8944,articleId-8908.html>>.

Cranny, C.J., Smith, P.C., & Stone, E.F. (1992). Job satisfaction. New York: Lexington Books.

Cuban, L. (1976). Urban chiefs under fire. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cuban, L. (1985). Conflict and leadership in the superintendency. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 28-30.

Cuban, L. (1998). The Superintendent Contradiction. Education Week, 18, 7 (September 23, 1998): 56.

Danitz, T. (2000). States Confronting School Superintendent Shortage. Stateline.org. <http://www.stateline.org/live/ViewPage.action?siteNodeId=136&languageId=1&contentId=13937>

Dawis, R. & Lofquist, L. (1984) A psychological theory of work adjustment: An individual-differences model and its application. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The “what” and the “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11, 227-268.

Decker, R., & Else, D. (1991). A study of the Iowa superintendency.

Farkas, S., Johnson, Duffett, A., & Feleno. (2001). Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about. New York, NY.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). On leadership. The Jossey-Bass Reader on Educational leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gawel, J. (1997). Herzberg's theory of motivation and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, [ED421486]

Glass, T. (2000). The shrinking applicant pool. Education Week, 20 (10), 50-51.

Glass, T., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. (2000). The study of the American school superintendency 2000. A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Glass, E.T., & Franceschini, L.A. (2007). The state of the American school superintendency. A mid-decade study. Plymouth, U.K.: Rowman & Littlefield Education in partnership with American Association of School Administrators.

Goldstein, A. (1992). Stress in the superintendency. The School Administrator, 9 (49), 8-17.

Goodman, R. H., & Zimmerman, W. G., Jr. (2000). Thinking differently: Recommendations for 21st Century school board/superintendent leadership, governance, and teamwork for high student achievement. Washington D.C: Education Commission of the States. <http://www.nesdec.org>.

Green, J. (2000). Job Satisfaction of Community College Chairpersons. Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, November 2000.

Hacket, R. D., & Guion, R. M. (1985). A reevaluation of the absenteeism-job satisfaction relationship. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 35, 340-381.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 159-70.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 250-279.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). The motivation to work (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Houston, P. (2001). Superintendent in the 21st century: It's not just a job, it's a calling. Phi Delta Kappan, 82.

Hoyle, J.R. (1989). Preparing the 21st century superintendent. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(5), 376-379.

Hoyle, J. (2002, September). The highest from of leadership. The School Administrator. Retrieved July 6, 2005, from <http://staging.aasa.rd.net/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=1785&snItemNumber=950&tnItemNumber=951>

Hoyle, J., Bjork, L., Collier, V., & Glass, T. (2005). The superintendent as CEO. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hull, W. T. (1974). Identification of various related to job satisfaction of California elementary principals. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 2581 A

Hunt, J and Richard N. O. & Schermerhorn, J. R. Jr. Organizational Behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2000.

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2004). School leadership for the 21st century initiative. Retrieved December 21, 2007 from <http://www.iel.org/programs/21st.html>

Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Constitution of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 193-200.

Jex, S. M. (2002). Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Johnson, N. A., & Holdaway, E. A. (1994). Facet importance and the job satisfaction of school principals. British Educational Research Journal, 20(1), 17-33.

Johnson, S. M. (1996). Leading to Change: The Challenge of the New Superintendency. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 319, ED 403 653.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83 (1), 17-34.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. Psychological Bulletin, 127 (3), 376-407.

Judge, T. A., & Watanabe, S. (1993). Another look at the job satisfaction-life satisfaction relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78 (6), 939-948.

Konnert, W. & Augenstein, J.J.(1990). The superintendency in the nineties: What superintendents and board members need to know. Technomic Publishing Company, Inc. Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

Kirst, M. (1991). School board: Evolution of an American institution. The American School Board Journal, 178 (11), A11-A14.

Lashway, L. (2002). The superintendent in the age of accountability. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 468515).

Lawler, E. E. (1973). Motivations in work organizations. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Lawler, E. E. (1994). Motivations in work organizations. San Francisco, CA: Joessey-Bass Publishers
- Lawler, E. E., & Porter, L. W. (1967). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. In M. Gruneberg (Ed.), Job Satisfaction: A Reader (pp. 207-217). New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Lawler, E. E., Nadler, D., & Cammann, C. (1980). Evaluation. In Lawler, E. E., Nadler, D., & Cammann, C. (Eds.), Organizational assessment (pp. 321-348). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lindstorm, D. (1988). A study of superintendent job satisfaction and board of trustees satisfaction and how they affect superintendent turnover. Dissertations Abstracts International, 50, 5. (University Microfische No. 89-18019).
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4 (4), 309-327.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand Mc Nally.
- Locke, E. A. (1984). Job satisfaction. In M. Gruneberg, & T. Wall. (Eds.), Social psychology and organizational behaviour. London, England: John Willey & Sons.
- Locke, E.A. & Lathan, G.P. (1990). Theory of goal setting and task performance. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. Pp 248-250.

- Lombardo, R. (2005). A study of job satisfaction among high school principals in Pennsylvania. Doctoral Dissertation, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Luthans, F. (1998). Organizational behaviour (8th ed.). Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Malanowski, R. (1999). A study of job satisfaction among urban superintendents in New Jersey. Doctoral Dissertation, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.
- Malone, B. G., Sharp, W. L., & Thompson, J.C. (October 25-28, 2000). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association. Chicago, ILL.
- Manning, R. (1976). The satisfiers and dissatisfiers of Virginia superintendents of schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Mayo, E. (1945). The social problems of an industrial civilization. New Hampshire: Ayer.
- Marelli, T. (2004). The Nurse Manager Survival Guide. (3rd ed.). Elsevier Health Sciences.
- Maslow A. H. (1943) A theory of human motivation, Psychological Review ,50, 370-96.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.

- McCormick, E.J. & Ilgen, D.R. (1985). Industrial and organizational psychology (8th ed.). London: Allen & Unwin.
- McGregor, D. 1960. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Miskel, C., Glassnapp, D., & Hatley, R. (1975). A test of the inequity theory for job satisfaction using educator's attitudes toward work motivation and work incentives. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 11(1), 38-54.
- Mitchell, T.R. & Lason, J.R. (1987). People in organization (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Montgomery, D. (1989), The fall of the house of labor: The workplace, the state, and american labor activism 1865-1925. Oxford: Cambridge University Press.
- Mountford, M. (2004). Motives and power of school board members: Implications for School board-superintendent relationships. Educational Administration Quarterly, 40 (5), 704-741.
- Munford, E. (1972). Job satisfaction. London: Longman.
- Murray, A.R (1999). Job Satisfaction of Professional and Paraprofessional Library Staff at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Chapel Hill, North Carolina, February, 1999.
- National School Boards Association. National School Boards Association CUBE (Council of Urban Boards of Education) Survey Report: Superintendent tenure. Alexandria, VA: Author, 2002. 13 pages.
- Nelson, D. K (1987). A study of the job satisfaction of Nebraska school superintendents. Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-- Lincoln. Digital commons.unl.edu/dissertations/AAlI 8810325.

Nestor-Baker, N. S., & Hoy W. K. (2001). Tacit Knowledge of School Superintendents: Its Nature, Meaning, and Content. Educational Administration Quarterly 37, 1 (February 2001): 86-129.

New Jersey Department of Education: District factor grouping system.
<http://www.state.nj.us/njded/finance/sf/dfgdesc.shtml>

O'Malley, R.J. (2004). A study of perceived job satisfaction factors among superintendents in two New Jersey counties. Doctoral Dissertation. Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.

O'Toole, J.& Lawler E. E. (2006). The New American Workplace. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Olson, L. (1992). School boards' marks on own assessment give critics credence. Education Week, 12 (8), 1-11.

Reisler, R. F. (1977). How highly educated people in service occupations experience their jobs: A presentation and analysis of the self-reported feelings and attitudes of public school superintendents. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 5509A. University of Massachusetts.

Reshef, Y. Elton Mayo & The Human relations Movement. School of Business, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Rogers, T. (2006). The 6th Triennial Study of the Superintendency in New York. New York: The Council of School Superintendents.

Schultz, D. P. (1982). Psychology and industry today. New York: Macmillan.

Schaefer, B. M. (1982). A summary of the teacher satisfaction survey conducted in December, 1980. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL.

Schnet, H. E. (1976). Need fulfillment and job satisfaction of principals classified by legal status in New York State. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 3, 2565A.

Seaton, D, Underwood, K., & Fortune, J. (1992). The burden school board presidents bear. *The American School Board Journal*, 179 (1), 32-37.

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline. New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1996). Leadership for the schoolhouse. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.

Sharp, W., Malone, B., & Walter, J. (2002, December) What's right about the superintendency? AASA Publications. Website:
<http://www.aasa.org/publications/sa/2002-12/colSharp.htm>

Sharp, L., William, & Walter K. J. (2004). *The school superintendent: The profession and the person*. Portland, OR: Rowman & Littlefield. 18.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Solomon, G. M. (2004). A study of perceived job satisfaction among superintendents in affluent (DFG I&J) public school districts in New Jersey. Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.

Southworth, W. (1968). The Superintendency., 1980. The Clearing House, pp.79-83.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of Job Satisfaction Survey. American Journal of Community Psychology, 13, 693-713.

Spector P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction: application, assessment, cause and consequences. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Spector, P.E. (1997). Job satisfaction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Staw, B. M., & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 469-480.

Taylor, W. F. (1911). The principles of scientific management New York: Harper Bros.

Tharenou, P. (1993). A test of reciprocal causality of absenteeism. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 14, 269-290.

Thompson, D.P., McNamara, J.F., & Hoyle, J.R. (1977). Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research findings. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33 (1), 7-37.

Trahair, C.S. R. 1984. The humanist temper: The life and work of Elton Mayo. Edison, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

United States Department of Education. (n.d.) No child left behind: A new era in education. Web Site: <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/presentation>.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A.G. (1988). The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Weiss, D. J. (1968). A study of the relationship of participation in decision-making, selected personality variables and job satisfaction of the education research and development council of elementary school principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Weiss, D.J. (1969). Occupational reinforcers, vocational needs, and job satisfaction. Paper presented at the 77th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Division 14. Minneapolis, MN.

Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1977). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press of Industrial Relations Center.

Wesson, H. L., & Grady, L. M. (1994). An analysis of women urban superintendents. Urban Education, 8 (4), 412-424.

Whaba, M.A. & Bridwell, L.G. (1974), Maslow reconsidered: A review on the need hierarchy theory. Academy of Management Proceedings, 514-20.

Whitsell, G. (1987). A study of factors which related to superintendents job satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1987). Dissertations Abstracts International, 48 (2).

Wright, M., & Custer, R. (1998). Why they enjoy teaching: The motivation of outstanding technology teachers. Journal of Technology Education, 9(2).

Yee, G., & Cuban, L. (1996). When is tenure long enough? A historical analysis of superintendent turnover and tenure in urban school districts. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32 (Supplemental, December, 1996). 615-641.

Appendix A
Superintendent's Letter

February 2008

Dear Superintendent:

I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University in the College of Education and Human Services. Presently, I am working on my doctoral dissertation entitled "A Study of Job Satisfaction and School Board Relationships of Public School Superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (Long Island), New York." This study will investigate the job satisfaction and school board relationships among public school superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

I am requesting your participation in this study. Participation in this study includes answering the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form, completing a brief Demographic Survey and a Board-Superintendent Relationships Survey. The three forms should take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete. For the purpose of this study, "boss," and "supervisor" on the questionnaire (page 3) refers to the Board of Education and "company" refers to School District/Board of Education. Please ignore page 4 of the questionnaire.

Participation is voluntary and all the material you complete will remain confidential and secure with this researcher. Under no circumstances will data be published which identifies the participants. Please note that the survey is not anonymous as the returned surveys are coded with participants' names for follow-up purposes. All replies will be coded and will be kept in a locked box. The code list will be in a safe deposit box. Results will be discussed with my dissertation mentor, but will not be seen by any unauthorized individual. All results will be in an aggregate form with no risks and no direct benefit for the participants. All data will be destroyed after the required period of three years.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) believes that the procedures adequately safeguard the subjects' privacy, welfare, civil liberties and rights. The chairperson of the IRB may be reached at 973-313-6314.

By returning the completed survey, it is assumed that you are thoroughly informed about the research and have voluntarily consented to participate in this study. Please keep this letter for your records. After reading the material above, it will be assumed that all your questions about the study are answered satisfactorily. If you would like to participate and do have questions, you can contact me by calling my dissertation mentor, Dr. Anthony Colella, at Seton Hall University at 973-761-9397 or by email at anthony130@aol.com.

Please complete the enclosed forms - questionnaire, demographic survey and board-superintendent relationships survey in the addressed stamped envelope provided by March 29, 2008. The data provided by you is greatly needed to assist research on the job satisfaction and school board relationships of public school superintendents.

Your participation in this study will be greatly appreciated. Your valuable time invested in this research will be helpful in guiding policy and practice.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Kishore Kuncham

Appendix B
Superintendent Demographic Survey

SUPERINTENDENT DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY
(PLEASE RETURN WITH MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE)

A STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION AND SCHOOL BOARD RELATIONSHIPS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL
 SUPERINTENDENTS IN NASSAU AND SUFFOLK COUNTIES (LONG ISLAND), NEW YORK

1. **NAME:**
 (OPTIONAL)* _____

2. **ADDRESS:**
 (OPTIONAL)* _____

*** I WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THIS STUDY:** ☐ YES ☐ NO

3. **LOCATION OF DISTRICT:** ☐ NASSAU ☐ SUFFOLK

4. **TYPE OF DISTRICT:** ☐ URBAN ☐ SUBURBAN ☐ RURAL

5. **STRUCTURE OF DISTRICT:** ☐ K-6 ☐ K-8 ☐ K-12 ☐ 7-12 ☐ OTHER

6. **STUDENTS ENROLLED:** ☐ 1-999 ☐ 1,000 – 2,999 ☐ 3,000 – 4,999
 ☐ 5,000 – 9,999 ☐ 10,000 – 24,999 ☐ 25,000 OR
 MORE

7. **GENDER:** ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE

8. **AGE:** ☐ 34 years or younger ☐ 55 – 59 years
 ☐ 35 – 39 years ☐ 60 – 64 years
 ☐ 40 – 44 years ☐ 65 years or older
 ☐ 45 – 49 years
 ☐ 50 – 54 years

9. **DOCTORATE DEGREE:** ☐ YES ☐ NO

10. **ANNUAL SALARY:** ☐ LESS THAN \$150,000 ☐ \$150,001 TO \$175,000 ☐ \$175,001 TO
 \$200,000

☐ \$200,001 TO \$225,000 ☐ \$225,001 TO \$250,000 ☐ \$250,001 TO
 \$275,000

☐ \$275,001 TO \$300,000 ☐ \$325,001 TO \$350,000 ☐ OVER \$350,000

11. **TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS AS A SUPERINTENDENT:** _____

12. **NUMBER OF YEARS IN THE CURRENT SUPERINTENDENT POSITION:** _____

Appendix C
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Sample

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

(short-form)



Vocational Psychology Research
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Copyright 1977

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell **how you feel about your present job**, what things you are **satisfied** with and what things you are **not satisfied** with.

On the basis of your answers and those of people like you, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people like and dislike about their jobs.

On the next page you will find statements about your **present job**.

- Read each statement carefully.
- Decide **how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job** described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

—if you feel that your job gives you **more than you expected**, check the box under **"Very Sat."** (Very Satisfied);

—if you feel that your job gives you **what you expected**, check the box under **"Sat."** (Satisfied);

—if you **cannot make up your mind** whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under **"N"** (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);

—if you feel that your job gives you **less than you expected**, check the box under **"Dissat."** (Dissatisfied);

—if you feel that your job gives you **much less than you expected**, check the box under **"Very Dissat."** (Very Dissatisfied).

- Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding **how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job**.

- Do this for **all** statements. Please answer **every** item.

Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your **present job**.

Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about

	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
1. Being able to keep busy all the time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The chance to work alone on the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The chance to do different things from time to time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The way my job provides for steady employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The chance to do things for other people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The chance to tell people what to do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The way company policies are put into practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. My pay and the amount of work I do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. The chances for advancement on this job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. The freedom to use my own judgment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. The working conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. The praise I get for doing a good job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AppendixD
Board-Superintendent Relationships Survey
Permission Letter

BOARD-SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONSHIPS SURVEY

(Adapted from the AASA 2006 State of the Superintendency Survey with approval)

A STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION AND SCHOOL BOARD RELATIONSHIPS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENTS IN NASSAU & SUFFOLK COUNTIES (LONG ISLAND), NEW YORK
(PLEASE RETURN WITH MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE)

1. From your perspective, how well does the board lead the district?
☐ Very Well ☐ Well ☐ Average ☐ Poorly ☐ Very Poorly

2. What is the approximate length of time (in years) a board member serves in your district?
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 years ☐ 10 or more

3. In your opinion, what is the most important reason the board hired you?
Choose only one.
☐ Ability to Maintain the Status Quo
☐ Experience as a Change Agent
☐ Financial Management Skills
☐ Leadership Ability
☐ Management Skills (e.g., instruction, personnel, etc.)
☐ Personal Characteristics (e.g., integrity, honesty, tact, etc.)
☐ Other: _____

4. How many hours per week do you spend in direct communication with board members (e.g., phone calls, meetings)?
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10
☐ 11 ☐ 12 ☐ 13 ☐ 14 ☐ 15 or more

5. How do you characterize your present relationship with the board?
☐ Very Good ☐ Good ☐ Poor ☐ Very Poor

BOARD-SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONSHIPS SURVEY

(Adapted from the AASA 2006 State of the Superintendency Survey with approval)

6. In your opinion, which of the following is your board's *primary* expectation of you as a superintendent?
- ☐ Educational Leader (e.g., curriculum and instruction, etc.)
 - ☐ Political Leader (e.g., board and community relations)
 - ☐ Managerial Leader (e.g., board and community relations)
 - ☐ Other: _____
7. Is your board evaluated? Choose all that *apply*.
- ☐ No
 - ☐ Yes, by External Evaluation (e.g., state department of education)
 - ☐ Yes, by Formal Self-Evaluation
 - ☐ Yes, by Re-Election Results
 - ☐ Yes, by Other Method(s): _____
8. From your perspective, does your board act ethically?
- ☐ All of the Time
 - ☐ Most of the Time
 - ☐ Seldom
 - ☐ Never
9. In your career as a superintendent, have you had an ethical problem with a board to the point that it forced you to leave a district?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
10. How do you characterize your community's support for your school district?
- ☐ Very Good
 - ☐ Good
 - ☐ Poor
 - ☐ Very Poor

Rowman & Littlefield Education

A Member of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706 USA

February 20, 2008

Dear Kishore Kuncham,

This permission grants, no fee, the non-exclusive right to use the following material published by Rowman & Littlefield Education:

Part IV. Board-Superintendent Relationships, Questions 39-48, Appendix B as found on pages 111-113 in The State of the American School Superintendency by Thomas Glass and Louis A. Franceschini.

Permission is granted for your coursework and/or dissertation at Seton Hall University only. If you should decide to publish independently at a later date, permission must be re-cleared.

It is understood that this material may be included in a dissertation that will be available through the ProQuest Doctoral Dissertation Project.

Please use the standard citation.

Sincerely,

Patricia Zline

Permissions
The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group
Phone: 301-459-3366, ext.5420
Fax: 301-429-5748
E-mail: pzline@rowman.com